DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 443 EA 030 354

AUTHOR	Wang, Margaret C.; Haertel, Geneva D.; Walberg, Herbert J.
TITLE	Achieving Student Success: A Handbook of Widely Implemented Research-Based Educational Reform Models. Publication Series No. 12.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Atlantic Lab. for Student Success, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	174p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.reformhandbook-LSS.org.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Decision Making; *Educational Change; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Nontraditional Education; *Program Implementation; Program Improvement; Research Projects; *Research Utilization; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Local schools and school districts lack organized information on school effectiveness to select programs and practices to meet their specific program improvement and implementation needs. Critical program features, implementation and training requirements, program costs, program-delivery systems, program impacts, and a host of other relevant factors necessary to enable schools to make informed choices are also needed. This handbook provides information on the design and implementation requirements of a variety of alternative programs and practices, and provides information on the program-delivery mechanisms in a usable form for school personnel. The handbook contains three sections: (1) a report on findings from a synthetic analysis of the design and implementation of 11 widely implemented research-based educational reform models; (2) a synopsis of the 11 widely implemented research-based reform programs and other research-based programs; and (3) a systematic procedure for using program information for informed decision making. An appendix contains a "Program Decision-Making Framework." (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 440 443

EA

Laboratory for Student Success

Achieving Student Success:
A Handbook of Widely Implemented Research-Based Educational Reform Models

by
Margaret C. Wang, Geneva D. Haertel, and Herbert J. Walberg

1998
Publication Series No. 12

Publication Series

EA 030 364

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory at Temple University
Center for Research in Human Development and Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Achieving Student Success:
A Handbook of Widely Implemented Research-Based
Educational Reform Models

by
Margaret C. Wang, Geneva D. Haertel, and Herbert J. Walberg

1998
Publication Series No. 12

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a contract to the Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) established at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE), and in part by CRHDE. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Copyright © 1998 Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education

Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091
Tel: 800-892-5550
Fax: 215-204-5130
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu

This *Handbook* is available online at http://www.reformhandbook-LSS.org

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS), the Mid-Atlantic Regional Education Laboratory at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Table of Contents

Introduction
1

PART I
An Analysis of Widely Implemented Research-Based Educational Reform Models
2

PART II
Program Descriptions

Widely Implemented Research-Based Educational Reform Models: 11
Accelerated Schools 13
Coalition of Essential Schools 19
Community for Learning 27
Core Knowledge 37
Different Ways of Knowing 43
HOTS 49
National Writing Project 55
Paideia 61
Reading Recovery 67
School Development Program 75
Success for All 85

Other Programs: 95
America's Choice™ School Design (formerly National Alliance for Restructuring Education) 97
ATLAS Communities 103
Co-NECT 109
Direct Instruction 115
Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound 121
High Schools That Work 127
Modern Red Schoolhouse 133
Purpose-Centered Education: Audrey Cohen College 139
Roots and Wings 145
Talent Development Schools 151
Urban Learning Center 167

PART III
Utilizing the Program Information for Decision Making
173

Developing an Indicator System for Program Analysis 173
Calculating Decision-Making Indicators 174
Other Applications of the Program Decision-Making Framework 175

Concluding Remarks
179

References
180

Appendix
181

INTRODUCTION

Findings from recent research, along with the practical wisdom culled from implementing innovative educational reform programs in schools, significantly contribute to our current understanding of what constitutes effective schooling and how student learning can be enhanced to achieve high standards of student outcomes. These findings suggest alternate approaches to the delivery of educational and related services that are substantially superior to widespread traditional practices (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993a, 1993b). Based on the wealth of findings from the "effectiveness" research, many varieties of experimental reform programs can be envisioned to enhance the capabilities of schools to more effectively achieve a high standard of educational outcomes of the increasingly diverse student populations schools are challenged to serve.

Although a number of innovative school reform programs are in operation and can be replicated or extended, there is very little evidence of systematic application of what is known to work in the service of student success. If widespread systematic implementation of the knowledge base on what works is to occur in schools with a high level of precision and credibility, significant efforts are needed to help schools in making informed decisions based on findings from research and practical applications of innovative programs in school settings.

The need for systematic information that addresses program design and implementation-related concerns has been widely expressed by school personnel and policymakers. Federal and state policymakers and local school boards are actively involved in establishing higher learning standards and accountability for student performance. They want evidence of better goal setting, rational program choices to attain those goals, and documented program results. Local schools and related social service agencies are presently faced with two demanding tasks: first, surmounting the difficulty of obtaining information on the design, implementation requirements, and efficacy of innovative programs and practices; and second, specifying criteria for making informed decisions on the feasibility and the site-specific compatibility of programs and practices that will best serve the program development and implementation objectives of a particular school or district.

Presently, there is little available information (in forms that are usable) to assist local schools and school districts in selecting programs and practices for meeting their specific program improvement and implementation needs. Systematically organized information is needed on what constitutes school effectiveness and the conditions that influence effective implementation. Information is also needed on critical program features, implementation and training requirements, program cost, program delivery systems, program impacts, and a host of other relevant factors that are critical to enable schools to make informed choices—to identify demonstrably effective programs and practices for adoption or adaptation that are aligned with their respective program improvement goals, resources, and needs.

It is in this context of addressing the concern of building a procedural knowledge base on how to coherently put what we know in a comprehensive reform framework that is useful and usable by practitioners that this Handbook was developed. Its twofold goal is to provide information on (a) the design and implementation requirements of a variety of demonstrably effective alternative programs and practices; and (b) program delivery mechanisms in forms that are usable by school personnel.

The Handbook is organized in three sections. The first is a report on findings from a synthetic analysis of the design and implementation of 11 widely implemented research-based educational reform models. The second section provides a synopsis of the 11 widely implemented research-based reform programs and other research-based programs that are gaining increasing attention by practitioners. The final section of the Handbook provides a systematic procedure for utilizing program information for informed decision making.

PART I:
AN ANALYSIS OF WIDELY IMPLEMENTED RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATIONAL REFORM MODELS

Findings from a synthetic analysis of 11 widely implemented research-based educational reform programs are discussed in this section of the Handbook. The programs were identified through systematic examination of the research base and the scope of their implementation in schools. Each of the programs has demonstrated a capacity for replication in at least 50 schools or has served 3,000 or more students.

The study began with sending of initial and follow-up letters to program developers to solicit program design materials, reports, and evaluations. In addition, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) database was searched to identify descriptive and research documents for each program. From several hundred research documents and project descriptions, the 11 widely implemented, research-based educational reform programs were described, analyzed, and compared. Table 1 provides a brief description of the 11 programs. More detailed discussion of the programs' design and implementation requirements are provided in the Program Description section of the Handbook.

PROGRAM FEATURES

PROGRAM TYPE

The 11 widely implemented reform programs are of two types: comprehensive and curricular. Comprehensive school reform programs focus on school governance and organization, classroom management, and pedagogical strategies, and emphasize students' development and learning success across core curricular content areas. Curricular reform programs emphasize curricular content development and student achievement in one or more specific academic disciplines (see Table 2 on page 4).

Curricular Reform

As shown in Table 2, eight programs focus on curricular changes. They include *Core Knowledge*, *Different Ways of Knowing*, *HOTS*, the *National Writing Project*, *Paideia*, *Reading Recovery*, and *Success for All*. Unlike comprehensive reform programs, curricular reform programs can be implemented in conventional schools with minimal restructuring. *Reading Recovery* and *HOTS*, for example, typically remove children from regular classrooms for needed instruction. *Different Ways of Knowing* infuses the arts, literature, and other activities into existing social studies courses without reorganizing schools. The *National Writing Project* delivers instruction within the prevalent departmentalized organization of high schools and as part of language arts instruction in elementary schools. *Core Knowledge* leaves about half of the school day for activities outside its scope. *Success for All* places students in homogeneous groups for reading instruction.

Curricular programs typically require educators to master or develop the use of content-specific curriculum materials and new teaching strategies. *Core Knowledge*, for example, supplies clear-cut content of instruction, but leaves lesson planning

TABLE 1
PROGRAM ABSTRACTS

ACCELERATED SCHOOLS (Hopfenberg, Levin, & Associates, 1993)
A comprehensive reform program that improves student learning through enriched curriculum and instruction, improved school climate, and school organizational changes based on stakeholder input (e.g., teachers, students, family, community).

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS (MacMullen, 1996)
A site-based reform founded on nine principles that encourage students to think critically and use their minds well. Teachers facilitate learning through coaching and students demonstrate their skills through authentic assessment.

COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING (Wang, 1992, 1997)
A data-based, comprehensive K-12 program that focuses on high academic achievement and positive student self-perception, and enhances schooling and life opportunities. The program includes a site-specific implementation planning framework that incorporates a schoolwide organizational structure, and a coordinated system of instruction and related services delivery.

CORE KNOWLEDGE (Hirsch, 1993)
A curriculum that develops students' cultural literacy by providing important knowledge about history, literature, geography, math, science, art, and music.

DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING (Catterall, 1995)
A reform that builds upon students' multiple intelligences and uses an interdisciplinary social science curriculum to strengthen students' verbal, mathematical, logical, social, and artistic skills.

HOTS (HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS) (Pogrow, 1995)
A pullout program that develops students' higher order thinking skills using technology and Socratic methods to replace the drill and practice approach used in many Title I programs (grades 4-6).

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT (Smith, 1996)
A program designed to improve student writing by providing professional development opportunities to teachers and stressing the role of the teacher as expert.

PAIDEIA (Adler, 1983)
A rigorous, liberal arts program designed to develop students' minds through a curriculum stressing classical works, didactic instruction, Socratic questioning, and coaching.

READING RECOVERY (Pinnell, 1995)
A pullout program that provides one-on-one tutoring by highly trained reading teachers to early readers with reading problems so that they may read at grade level and continue improving without further remediation.

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (Comer, 1996)
A comprehensive program that unites the resources of the school, family, and community to promote holistic child development.

SUCCESS FOR ALL (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996)
A program that stresses reading and language arts and helps schools and classrooms in preventing academic deficiencies and in intervening, as needed, to overcome problems. This program is based on the premise that all students can and should succeed, and utilizes homogenously grouped small-group instruction and one-on-one tutoring.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2
PROGRAM FEATURES

PROGRAM FEATURES	ACCELERATED SCHOOLS	COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS	COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING	CORE KNOWLEDGE	DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING	HOTS	NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT	PAIDEIA	READING RECOVERY	SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT	SUCCESS FOR ALL
TYPE OF REFORM											
Comprehensive Reform Program	X	X	X						X		
Curricular Reform Program				X	X	X	X	X	X		X
GOALS											
Improve Student Learning	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Meet the Learning Needs of Students Placed At Risk	X		X			X			X	X	X
Foster Positive Student Perceptions			X							X	
Increase Student-directed Learning	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Increase Equity in Opportunity to Learn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Restructure School Organization	X	X	X		X					X	
Increase Family Involvement	X		X		X				X	X	X
Increase Community Involvement	X		X		X					X	
Increase Access to Non-academic Services (e.g., medical, social)	X		X							X	X
Improve School Climate	X	X	X							X	
Enrich Curriculum and Instruction	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Redefine Relations Among Teachers, Learners, & Curriculum	X	X	X		X		X			X	
Expand Professional Roles of Regular Classroom Teachers	X	X	X		X		X			X	X
STUDENTS SERVED											
All Students	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X
Title I	X		X			X				X	X
Special Needs/Mild-Moderate Handicap			X			X				X	X
Young Readers with Reading Difficulties			X						X		X
ESL or Bilingual	X		X						X		X
Urban Students			X							X	X
Rural Students			X								
GRADE LEVELS											
Pre-K			X						X		X
K-1									X		
K-6 (Elementary)	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Middle/Junior High School	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	
High School		X	X				X	X			
CURRICULAR FOCUS											
Reading	X				X				X	X	X
Writing					X		X				
Mathematics				X	X			X		X	
Language Arts/Literature				X	X			X			X
Science				X	X			X			
History and Social Sciences				X	X			X			
Fine Arts				X	X			X			
All Subjects	X	X	X							X	
Critical Thinking Skills and Learning Process	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Study Skills	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and material development to teachers; *Different Ways of Knowing* calls for knowledge of Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences; and *Paideia* depends on skilled Socratic teaching. In contrast, *HOTS*, *Reading Recovery*, and *Success for All* provide required materials and teaching procedures. The *National Writing Project* and *Different Ways of Knowing* require teacher collaboration to develop new materials and lesson plans.

Comprehensive School Reform

Accelerated Schools, the *Coalition of Essential Schools*, *Community for Learning* (previously known as the *Adaptive Learning Environments Model*), and *School Development* focus on improving student learning in all subject areas using a comprehensive improvement framework. Characterized by broad goals, these programs change the conventional school's management and organization. They employ, for example, flexible scheduling and small learning communities that work together to create interdisciplinary curricula. They bring together parents, educators, students, and community members to define a coherent vision of the school. In some cases, these stakeholders are free to define their own vision. *Accelerated Schools*, *Community for Learning*, and *School Development*, for example, have specific parent involvement components. In other cases, such as the *Coalition of Essential Schools*, the school's vision is expected to be congruent with a set of clear principles.

Comprehensive school reforms promote schoolwide reconceptions of where learning takes place and how it should be measured. For example, *Community for Learning* and *School Development* connect learning to the physical and psychological development of the child and link schools to medical, psychological, legal, and social services in a coordinated network. Teachers in the *Coalition of Essential Schools* and *Accelerated Schools* assess student learning in new ways, including portfolios and exhibitions.

Goals, Grade Levels, and Focus

Although each of the programs is distinctive, they share some common goals. As shown in Table 2, each of the 11 programs aims to increase learning through research-based practices. Most aim to expand the professional role of teachers, improve the culture and climate of schools and classrooms, and include a family and community involvement component.

The programs are most frequently implemented in kindergarten through eighth grade. Nine are designed to educate all children in the general school population, although several have been widely implemented as inclusive educational programs that integrate students with special needs (e.g., students receiving Title I and special education services) with the support of specialist teachers. The programs vary in their curricular emphases. Some stress learning and teaching in particular content areas such as reading, writing, language arts, history, mathematics, and science, while others stress critical thinking and study skills. Few do both.

PREVALENT PROGRAM PRACTICES

Research on effective teaching and implementation of innovative school reform programs has identified a large number of practices that are important to learning. However, policymakers and practitioners find the research base on the multiplicity of learning influences perplexing and are in need of clearer guidance concerning the identification of specific practices most likely to maximize school learning.

The information on prevalent practices shown in Table 3 can facilitate program choices. Educators, for example, who are interested in a strong academic focus across curricular areas might select *Core Knowledge* or *Paideia*. These two programs, however, differ in the number and type of classroom practices they emphasize. *Paideia* employs cooperative learning, didactic instruction, and teachers as learning facilitators. *Core Knowledge* is less directive concerning the classroom practices employed. For educators who are interested in using a coordinated academic and related services approach, *School Development* or *Community for Learning* are possible choices. *Community for Learning*, however, also has a strong academic emphasis that includes adaptive instructional strategies, varying grouping practices, cooperative learning, and one-on-one tutoring.

Among the 54 instructional practices identified as key components of these programs, 25 practices are more firmly grounded in research, according to the knowledge base on what helps students learn (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993). The practices shown in Table 3 that are indicated with an asterisk have a substantial research basis.

As reflected in Table 3, there are some noteworthy differences across programs. The last row of Table 3 shows that programs differ in the number and type of research-based practices they employ. For example, the *National Writing Project* and *Paideia* employ few research-based practices, while *Community for Learning*, *School Development*, and *Success for All* include many research-based practices. The comprehensive school reform programs employ an average of 19 research-based practices, compared to 11.4 for curriculum-focused reform programs. The greatest difference among these two types of programs is in the number of research-based practices involving school organization and climate they employ. Comprehensive reforms incorporate an average of 5.7 such practices, compared to only 1.5 employed by curriculum-focused programs.

Community for Learning, *Reading Recovery*, and *Success for All* incorporate the following practices that are related to improved learning: frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students; grouping practices, tutorials, and metacognitive strategies; and frequent assessments to improve learning. Other effective practices are those that stress positive, supportive learning environments, including high expectations for all students; frequent and positive social interactions among teachers and students; positive classroom and school climate; cooperative learning; and parent involvement. *School Development* employs these practices

TABLE 3
PREVALENT PROGRAM PRACTICES

PRACTICES EMPHASIZED[1]	ACCELERATED SCHOOLS	COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS	COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING	CORE KNOWLEDGE	DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING	HOTS	NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT	PAIDEIA	READING RECOVERY	SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT	SUCCESS FOR ALL	
CLASSROOM PRACTICES												
* High Expectations for Students	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11
* Frequent High-quality Academic Interactions Among Teachers and Students	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11
Active Learning	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10
Constructivist Strategies	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10
* Metacognitive Strategies		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9
Teacher as Facilitator	x	x	x		x	x	x	x				7
* Student-directed Learning		x	x				x		x	x	x	6
* Direct Instruction			x	x		x		x	x	x	x	7
* Small-group Instruction	x		x			x		x		x	x	6
* Frequent High-quality Social Interactions Among Teachers and Students	x	x	x		x				x	x		6
* Cooperative Learning	x	x	x					x		x	x	6
* Positive Classroom Climate	x	x	x		x					x		5
Teacher Modeling of Attitudes, Behaviors, and Skills	x	x	x				x	x				5
Teacher Models Higher Order Thinking	x	x	x			x	x	x				6
Hands-on Activities	x	x	x		x		x					5
* Adaptive Instructional Strategies			x			x			x	x	x	5
* Peer Tutoring	x		x		x						x	4
* Tutoring-Teacher/Aide and Student			x			x			x		x	4
Heterogeneous Grouping	x	x	x								x	4
Use of Technology	x					x						2
Student Choice of Learning Activities		x										1
Multiple Intelligences					x							1
Homogeneous Grouping											x	1
CLASSROOM PRACTICES FEATURED	**15**	**15**	**19**	**3**	**11**	**12**	**10**	**11**	**10**	**12**	**14**	**132**
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT												
* Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11
Attend to Foundation of Basic Skills	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11
Learning Processes	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	9
Authentic Assessments	x	x	x		x			x		x	x	8
* Tailored to Student Ability and Academic Background	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	x	8
* Integration of Content Areas	x	x	x		x		x	x		x		7
* Tailored to Student Cultural Background	x	x			x				x	x	x	6
Challenging Academic Content	x	x	x	x		x		x			x	7
* Use of Individual Learning Plans			x						x	x	x	4
* Frequent Assessments			x					x	x		x	4
Multicultural Content				x								1
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES FEATURED	**8**	**8**	**9**	**4**	**7**	**5**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**76**

[1] The list of practices was compiled from program descriptions prepared by the program developers. Practices that are marked were identified in the program developers' materials as key elements of their program.

*Program practices marked with an asterisk are firmly grounded in research on what influences student learning (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3 (CONT'D)
PREVALENT PROGRAM PRACTICES

PRACTICES EMPHASIZED[1]	ACCELERATED SCHOOLS	COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS	COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING	CORE KNOWLEDGE	DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING	HOTS	NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT	PAIDEIA	READING RECOVERY	SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT	SUCCESS FOR ALL	
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE												
Teacher Collaboration on Content and Instruction	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	9
* Parent Involvement	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	8
School Restructuring	x	x	x		x			x		x		6
Consensus Building (to initiate and/or sustain program)	x	x	x	x						x	x	6
* Principal as Facilitator and Support Provider	x	x	x			x				x	x	6
* Community Involvement	x		x		x		x			x		5
Kindergarten	x		x	x						x	x	5
Prevention Oriented		x	x						x	x	x	5
Assess School/Program Strengths and Weaknesses	x	x	x				x				x	5
* Positive Schoolwide Climate	x	x	x							x		4
Flexible Scheduling	x	x	x					x				4
Shared School Vision	x	x		x						x		4
* Small Class Size	x					x		x			x	4
* Shared Decision Making on School Policies	x	x	x							x		4
Coordinated School-linked Services	x		x							x	x	4
Site-Specific Improvement Plan	x	x	x							x		4
Site-Based Governance	x	x								x		3
* Inclusive School			x							x	x	3
Pullout for Instruction						x			x		x	3
Encourage Action Research		x					x					2
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE PRACTICES[2] FEATURED	**16**	**14**	**15**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**15**	**11**	**94**
NUMBER OF PRACTICES FEATURED	**39**	**37**	**43**	**12**	**22**	**20**	**19**	**20**	**21**	**35**	**34**	
NUMBER OF RESEARCH-BASED PRACTICES FEATURED	**17**	**15**	**23**	**5**	**12**	**11**	**7**	**10**	**14**	**21**	**19**	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

both to improve school climate and enhance students' cognitive and affective outcomes. In contrast, *Reading Recovery* and the *National Writing Project* emphasize more specific instructional strategies.

Research-based practices may be important criteria for selecting programs. While the sheer number of research-based practices cannot be regarded as the single measure of program effectiveness, it does provide evidence of the program's potential effectiveness if fully implemented.

Program Implementation Requirements

The programs specify a variety of pre-implementation preparations and implementation requirements. Comparisons of some key program differences are as follows:

- **Use of specifically designed curriculum materials:** *Core Knowledge*, *Higher Order Thinking Skills*, *Paideia*, *Reading Recovery*, and *Success for All* require the purchase of specially designed instructional materials and teaching strategies.
- **Approach to program delivery:** *Reading Recovery* and *Higher Order Thinking Skills* use pull-out strategies, which provide special instruction for targeted students, while other programs use inclusive approaches to classroom instruction.
- **Professional development focus:** *Different Ways of Knowing* and *School Development* train teachers in new ways of thinking about teaching and learning; the *National Writing Project* provides teachers with new skills and pedagogies through workshops, networks, and institutes to ensure that teachers share their expertise with each other. The *Coalition of Essential Schools* engages school staff in discussions of why and how to teach. *Accelerated Schools* engages all stakeholders in discussions of the school's mission. *Community for Learning* uses data on degree of program implementation and student performance to develop implementation plans to meet classroom- and school-level goals.
- **Amount of professional development:** *Different Ways of Knowing* and *Success for All* rely on several days of professional development with follow-up activities. The *National Writing Project* employs a summer institute that lasts several weeks. *Reading Recovery* requires teachers to attend an entire year of graduate-level courses in residence at a university-based training center. *School Development* focuses on changing the culture of the school and spreading professional development over a period of years. *Community for Learning* employs a professional development delivery system that provides 3–4 days of pre-implementation training and ongoing data-based staff development targeted for individual staff.
- **Follow-up support:** Support includes newsletters and teacher networks; technical assistance; extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion; and the regular collection of new diagnostic and context-specific information on teachers and students. Each program engages in several types of follow-up support.

- **Accountability for implementation:** *Accelerated Schools* provides assistance to schools through self-assessment. *Community for Learning* employs a degree-of-implementation assessment measure to monitor implementation progress and plan staff support.
- **Structure of implementation process:** *Community for Learning*, *Reading Recovery*, *School Development*, and *Success for All* require highly structured implementation, while the *National Writing Project* and the *Coalition of Essential Schools* have fewer clearly defined implementation steps.
- **Adaptability of implementation process:** *Accelerated Schools*, *Community for Learning*, and *School Development* provide more flexibility in tailoring implementation to the school site. *Core Knowledge*, *Paideia*, *Reading Recovery*, and *Success for All* allow less flexibility.

Funding and Time Requirements

The programs vary in the amount of time and costs required for implementation. Specific dollar amounts needed for implementation vary among programs and specific sites depending on school size, amount of professional development required, and substitute teaching costs to cover teacher planning and professional development time. Prospective consumers can expect reform programs to provide information on the costs of training, additional staff requirements, curriculum materials, equipment required, and other fees. Among the programs that require substantial staff preparation costs are *Accelerated Schools*, *Community for Learning*, the *Coalition of Essential Schools*, *Higher Order Thinking Skills*, *Reading Recovery*, *School Development*, and *Success for All*. The *National Writing Project*, on the other hand, requires little additional cost. They rely heavily on teacher networks for staff renewal and dissemination. *Reading Recovery* requires a full year of university study for teachers in training. Most of the other programs require from 3-10 days of professional development.

PART II:
PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

In this section of the handbook, synopses of selected research-based reform programs are provided. Included in the synopsis of each program are the following categories of information:

Program overview
Program components
Program goals
Students served
Grade levels
Program practices
Implementation
Expected program outcomes
Program effects
Related publications

The first part of this program description section includes the 11 widely implemented research-based reform programs. The second part includes brief descriptions of research-based reform programs that are receiving increasing attention by school staff and policymakers.

ACCELERATED SCHOOLS

CERAS 109
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3084

Phone: 650-725-8573
Fax: 650-723-7578
Web: www-leland.stanford.edu/group/ASP/index.html

Accelerated Schools

Program Overview

Accelerated Schools is a comprehensive reform program that improves student learning through enriched curriculum and instruction, improved school climate, and school organizational changes based on stakeholder input (e.g., teachers, students, family, and community) (Hopfenberg, Levin, & Associates, 1993). Founded in 1986 by Henry Levin at Stanford University, the Accelerated Schools program aims to develop the best schools for all children, providing every child with the opportunity to succeed as a creative, critical, productive member of our society. The program serves students, staff, teachers, parents, and the community in poorly performing schools. Accelerated Schools strives to reduce or eliminate the risk of school failure for students in adverse situations and conditions as early as possible. The program was originally intended to focus on elementary schools but later expanded to include junior high or middle schools as well. Much of the program emphasis is on development of the problem-solving capacity of the schools.

Three main beliefs support successful Accelerated Schools. First, schools must develop unanimity of purpose and support, meaning that after reflection and debate, all the school's stakeholders reach consensus about the school's basic goals. Second, school site personnel must be empowered to make decisions. This requires greater-than-usual roles for teachers and parents and other key stakeholders in school decision making. Finally, the project team must identify and capitalize on all the school's assets, including interests and skills of the students, staff, and larger community.

Program Components

One component of Accelerated Schools is new school structures. Site-based committees of school personnel are formed to facilitate the implementation process and address specific concerns around areas like assessment, family involvement, or student discipline. These groups are called "cadres" and meet on a weekly basis. A steering committee comprised of the principal, representative teachers, other school staff, students, and parents is assembled and provides input on decisions. Finally, the school as a whole must approve all major decisions on curriculum, instruction, and resource allocation. The principal is viewed as the "keeper of the dream" and must consequently shift from the traditional role of school policy enforcer to that of facilitator, coordinator, and listener. These structures support an enriched curriculum and instructional program that each school tailors to its own strengths, weaknesses, and needs. The Accelerated Schools program provides no single model of what an Accelerated School should look like.

Other components of Accelerated Schools include professional development for teachers and principals, both on- and off-site. The program also encourages a self-assessment program for schools so that they can evaluate their strengths and weaknesses and build upon the talents and resources of their students and staff. In

addition, the program offers technical assistance to member schools, maintains regional satellite centers to provide training and facilitate collaboration, and coordinates a network of schools that support each other in their restructuring.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
ESL or bilingual students

GRADE LEVELS

Accelerated Schools is a comprehensive reform program that is implemented in grades K-8.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate

Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
Teacher models higher order thinking
Hands-on activities
* Peer tutoring
Heterogeneous grouping
Use of technology

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Attend to foundation of basic skills
Learning processes
Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
Challenging academic content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
Kindergarten
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision
* Small class size
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-specific improvement plan
Site-based governance

IMPLEMENTATION

It takes approximately 6 years for a traditional school to become an Accelerated School. Essential to this transformation is the five-stage inquiry process, which includes focusing on the problem, brainstorming solutions, creating a synthesis, test piloting an experimental program, and evaluating and assessing the pilot to determine whether it effectively addressed the problems. To aid in the inquiry process, the National Center for Accelerated Schools distributes an "Assessment Toolkit," which consists of a school questionnaire, a coach's log, a school data portfolio, school documents, and Accelerated School benchmarks. Data collected with these

tools are used by staff, parents, and students to create a detailed report on the school. With this insight, school members build a vision of the school to be attained over the next six years.

The next step requires the school staff to create a means by which the new vision can be attained. This may result in a list of as many as 50 changes, which must in turn be prioritized. Teams of the school's stakeholders (called "cadres" by Accelerated Schools) then begin working toward those goals. A new school governance system comprised of the principal, representative teachers, other school staff, students, and parents provides input on decisions. At this stage, the school's stakeholders are trained in inquiry methods and provided with other tools to better enable them to work effectively together towards the new vision. Once the school is in the process of moving toward its vision, it is viewed as "accelerated." As the implementation continues, schools tap into the talents of teachers and staff and build upon parental and school district support to enrich classroom instruction. They also plan their own programs of staff development and program evaluation.

While many studies have examined the implementation of *Accelerated Schools*, Kushman and Chenoweth (1996) are conducting one of the most comprehensive, long-term qualitative studies of Accelerated Schools implementation. In their examination of implementation in three Accelerated Schools in an urban district, these researchers use a four-phase model of change. They identify several factors in successful *Accelerated Schools* implementation and conclude that, in the early phases of the *Accelerated Schools* process, activities to create cohesion and shared meaning among the school's diverse stakeholders are crucial. The authors describe how the meaning of change is different for teachers and administrators because of their different roles and further describe how these different perceptions of change must be addressed throughout the implementation process. They note that teachers experience the greatest sense of ambiguity about change among all stakeholders but that teachers' perceptions can be made more positive through well-planned experiences to build a new vision for their school early in the change process.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Increased mastery of basic and higher order thinking skills
- Improvement of student achievement and learning
- Utilization of more innovative and effective curriculum and instruction practices
- Improvement of student attitudes towards schooling and learning
- Increased parental and community involvement
- Improvement of school climate
- At-risk students up to grade level by sixth grade

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Internal evaluations from Accelerated Schools sites reveal improved standardized test scores; increased enrollments and declining student suspensions, uncleared

absences, and truancy referrals; and increased parent involvement in school activities (Chasin & Levin, 1995; National Center on the Accelerated Schools Project, 1995; McCollum, 1994; St. John, Allen-Hayes, Davidson, & Meza, 1992). Although there is substantial evidence of changes in student outcomes in these internal evaluations, the evaluation designs often lacked control groups, and little longitudinal data was collected, thereby threatening the internal validity of the findings. The Accelerated Schools program maintains that 5-6 years are necessary for implementation. To date, only a few schools have employed the program for this length of time; thus, it is still too early to draw conclusions about program effects.

Yearly updated information on Accelerated Schools' effects is available from the Accelerated Schools National Center. While these updates are not formal evaluations, they do provide information about student achievement and learning, enriched curriculum and instruction, improvements in school climate, and family and community involvement. According to the Accelerated Schools newsletter (National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project, 1995-96) and personal communication with project staff (August 20, 1997), a third-party evaluation is in progress.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Chasin, G., & Levin, H. M. (1995). Thomas Edison Accelerated Elementary School. In J. Oakes and K. H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating new educational communities: Ninety-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I* (pp. 130-146). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hopfenberg, W. S., Levin, H. M., & Associates. (1993). *The Accelerated Schools resource guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kushman, J. W., & Chenoweth, T. G. (1996). Building shared meaning and commitment during the courtship phase. In C. Finnan, E. P. St. John, J. McCarthy, & S. P. Slovacek (Eds.), *Accelerated schools in action: Lessons from the field* (pp. 82-103). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

McCollum, H. (1994). *School reform for youth at risk: Analysis of six change models. Volume I: Summary and Analysis* (Contract No, LC #89089001). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project. (1995-96). An external assessment of Accelerated Schools. *Accelerated Schools, 5*(2), 12-13, 22.

St. John, E. P., Allen-Haynes, L., Davidson, B., & Meza, J. (1992). *The Louisiana Accelerated Schools Project: First year evaluation report*. New Orleans, LA: University of New Orleans, Louisiana Accelerated Schools Center.

COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS

Brown University
P.O. Box 1969
Providence, RI 02192

Phone: 401-863-3384
Fax: 401-863-2045
Web: www.essentialschools.org

Coalition of Essential Schools

Program Overview

The Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) is a site-based reform founded on nine principles that encourage students to think critically and use their minds well. Teachers facilitate learning through coaching, and students demonstrate their skills through authentic assessment (MacMullen, 1996). Founded in 1985 at Brown University by Ted Sizer, CES seeks to redesign American schools for better student learning and achievement using the following common principles:

- Schools must focus on the resourceful use of the mind or using minds well. The focus of schooling is intellectual.
- To accomplish this, schools must focus on a limited number of essential skills and subject matters. There must be an emphasis on deep understanding rather than the effort merely to cover content. The aphorism "less is more" should dominate.
- These goals must apply to all children.
- Teaching and learning have to be personalized. No teachers will have more students than they can get to know well enough to teach well.
- As we learn when we're engaged, the learner must do the work. The governing metaphor is student-as-worker.
- The high school diploma should be awarded only when the student exhibits the quality and breadth of intellectual performance worthy of that recognition.
- School must be a self-consciously decent place.
- Principals and teachers should themselves model the rich general education expected of students, even as they are at the same time experts in one or another discipline or craft. Teachers should expect multiple obligations and a sense of commitment to the entire school.
- Teachers should work with no more than 80 students, have substantial time for collective planning, and receive competitive salaries. This is to be accomplished with no more than a 10% increase in per pupil costs.

CES promotes no single model of school reform. Consequently, CES schools look different depending on the students and the community. Nonetheless, most CES schools share some common characteristics. Among these are a focus on academics; extensive teacher collaboration; core classes; block scheduling; demonstration of student mastery through exhibitions, portfolios, and other authentic assessments; and frequent ongoing conversations by faculty members about the purpose and methods of schooling. Currently more than 1,000 schools are part of CES.

Program Components

CES offers no specific model for changing school practices; rather, each school develops a plan appropriate to its own context based on nine CES principles. Member schools engage in substantial professional development to build their capacity to

implement CES reform. They also collaborate with other CES schools and outside organizations to foster a climate promoting school change. CES offers intensive, focused professional development programs during the summer and technical assistance to schools throughout the year so they can meet their own reform goals.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

GRADE LEVELS

The Coalition of Essential Schools is a comprehensive reform program that is implemented in middle/junior high and high school.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
Active learning
Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
Teacher models higher order thinking
Hands-on activities
Heterogeneous grouping
Student choice of learning activities

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
  Challenging academic content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  School restructuring
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
  Prevention oriented
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Flexible scheduling
  Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
  Site-specific improvement plan
  Site-based governance
  Encourage action research

IMPLEMENTATION

The process for becoming a CES school typically requires a school to move through the following stages: exploring, in which individuals interested in rethinking their school's priorities and practices initiate a "conversation" among faculty, parents, and/or school board members about the nine principles as a way to structure change; and planning, in which the whole school community agrees on a plan of action for the first year of changes in the classroom. When the initial program is in place and a commitment to the criteria can be demonstrated, a school may apply for membership to CES.

Once membership is established and the action plan is in effect in the classroom, the school focuses on making the needed adjustments during the first year. Subsequently, every 2 years, member schools assess their own progress and report in writing on their achievements to date, new or unresolved obstacles to change, and their plan for the next 2 years. Teachers and administrators are expected to work collaboratively on a regular basis with CES schools and colleagues to reflect on the progress of the program, to review and renew their commitment to CES change, and to outline their plans for the future. Schools that join CES are expected to make at least a 4-year commitment.

The school change plan must be for the entire school. While a school may begin its program with a small portion of its students and staff, the long-term goal must allow for the CES philosophy to shape the entire school. Schools must anticipate a certain amount of tension over the changes, such as increased demands on teacher and staff time for new activities and greater responsibility. Also, schools may experience tension between teachers and administrators who wish to adhere to traditional schooling methods and others who embrace the CES principles.

CES has been the subject of nearly 150 research and evaluation studies (MacMullen, 1996), many of them focusing on implementation. Among the most in-depth studies of CES was a 3-year inquiry by Wasley, King, and Louth (1995). They found that building the capacity for faculty to rigorously analyze student learning needs and tailor appropriate instruction was at the heart of the CES schools that changed the most. Several implementation studies (Darling-Hammond, Ancess, & Falk, 1995; Prestine & Bowen, 1993) confirmed Wasley et al.'s findings that CES requires a school culture of self-analysis and dialogue. In addition, these studies noted that successful CES schools have caring, personalized environments as well as high academic expectations.

Muncey and McQuillan (1996) conducted a 5-year ethnographic study of 8 CES schools and concluded that many lacked consensus about the need for fundamental reform in their structure or instructional practices. The lack of consensus increased tensions among faculty members about the perceptions of their job, the school's mission, and the best ways to educate students. In these schools, CES principles were not a whole-school effort but were implemented by individuals or small groups of teachers.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Students are able to use their minds well to think deeply and critically.
- Schools are places that embody a sense of community and focus on students' intellectual development.

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The following characterization of the Coalition of Essential School's program effects employs key studies from a substantial knowledge base describing this reform effort. Stringfield et al. (1994) report findings from the first year of their longitudinal study examining cross-program comparisons. CES is among the 10 strategies examined. The authors caution that their data are not to be taken as summative evaluation of programs but rather as a snapshot of program effects. Compared to the other nine programs, CES demonstrated higher than average levels of student engagement in learning. Substantially greater interaction with teachers during instruction was also noted, but a slightly greater percentage of students was found to be socially engaged or uninvolved during instruction. CES also showed greater than average rates of interaction between students with teachers, but less interaction with aides and peers.

In studies of CES students and alumni (Bensman, 1994; Technical Data Corporation, 1992; Riedel, 1995; Ancess, 1995; Raywid, 1994), students and former students report that they valued the personalized attention, care, and high expectations of their teachers. Raywid (1994) concludes that students who are at risk of school failure can succeed in schools that have implemented CES principles, particularly in those schools with a strong professional community. These cases support the importance of a strong professional community in translating CES principles into improved student learning. In a profile of a CES school, Cushman (1994) reported increased academic performance of students over 4 years on the Maine Educational Assessment, an increased number of student enrollments in Advanced Placement courses, and increased students' plans to attend college.

In 1992, CES worked with Educational Resources Group, an independent firm, to design a longitudinal 8-year evaluation to examine student outcomes. Unfortunately, funding for full implementation of the evaluation was not located; however, a pilot study was initiated (Cushman, 1991; 1994). Results from this independent evaluation of 8 schools used measures other than standardized achievement tests. The pilot study revealed lower dropout rates, higher attendance, and fewer disciplinary actions in CES schools compared to districtwide data or to the school's rates prior to CES implementation. One of the 8 schools showed some evidence of increased student achievement. Although these results are largely positive, they must be interpreted cautiously because comparison groups may not be comparable, and archive data was not collected systematically.

Chicago's implementation of 11 CES schools was riddled by difficulties that compromised the third-party evaluation results (Sikorski, Wallace, Stariha, & Rankin, 1993). Results indicated that CES schools' standardized test scores, attendance, and graduation rates dropped, while dropout rates increased. The evaluators concluded that the performance was due to implementation difficulties, not the program's effects.

One cost-benefit study, conducted by Tainsh for the Bruner Foundation (1994), concludes that enormous social benefits accrue from the successful implementation of CES. The data were gathered from graduates of a Coalition high school in East Harlem, NY and compared with data from graduates of comparable non-Coalition high schools. Tainsh determined that, while CES costs were comparable to those in non-CES schools, CES schools produced dramatic differences in social benefits. One year of CES education resulted in the following savings to society: $8.6 million in reduced juvenile justice costs, $1 million in public assistance, and $624,000 net benefit in earned income.

Despite the reform's visibility and abundant funding, its documented impact on student learning remains unclear. Herman and Stringfield (1997) conclude that "Sizer [the program's founder] noted that evaluations of CES efforts would not be simple. The CES philosophy is not supportive of using traditional norm-referenced tests or other readily standardizable measures" (p. 47).

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Ancess, J. (1995). *An inquiry high school: Learner-centered accountability at the Urban Academy*. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.

Bensman, D. (1994). *Lives of graduates of Central Park East Elementary Schools: Where have they gone? What did they really learn?* New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.

Cushman, K. (1994). A rural school asks more, gets more. *Performance, 12*. Providence, RI: Brown University, Coalition of Essential Schools.

Cushman, K. (1991). Taking stock: How are essential schools doing? *Horace, 8*(1). Providence, RI: Brown University, Coalition of Essential Schools.

Darling-Hammond, L., Ancess, J., & Falk, B. (1995). *Authentic assessment in action: Studies of schools and students at work*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Herman R., & Stringfield, S. (1997). *Ten promising programs for educating all children: Evidence of impact*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Science.

MacMullen, M. M. (1996, October). *Taking stock of a school reform effort: A research collection and analysis*. Providence, RI: Brown University, Annenburg Institute for School Reform.

Muncey, D. E., & McQuillan, P. J. (1996). *Reform and resistance in schools and classrooms*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Prestine, N.A., & Bowen, C. (1993). Benchmarks of change: Assessing Essential School restructuring efforts. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*(3), 298-319.

Raywid, M. A. (1994). A school that really works: Urban Academy. *Journal of Negro Education, 63*(1), 93-109.

Riedel, J. A. (1995, April). *A longitudinal study of students' engagement and perceptions in a Re: Learning high school*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Sikorski, M. F., Wallace, T., Stariha, W. E., & Ranken, V. E. (1993). School reform and the curriculum. *New Directions for Program Evaluation, 59*.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M., Puma, M., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children, first year report* (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Tainsh, P. (1994). *Central Park East Elementary Schools: Social benefit analysis study*. New York: Bruner Foundation.

Technical Development Corporation. (1992). *Children's Hospital/Fenway Collaboration program evaluation*. Boston: Technical Development Corporation.

Wasley, P. A., King, S. P., & Louth, C. (1995). Creating Coalition schools through collaborative inquiry. In J. Oakes & K. H. Quartz (Eds.), *Creating new educational communities: Ninety-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 202-223). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING

Temple University Center for Research
in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091

Phone: 800-892-5550
Fax: 215-204-5130
Web: www.temple.edu/LSS/cfl.htm

COMMUNITY FOR LEARNING

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Community for Learning (CFL) program is a comprehensive approach to school reform that aims to significantly improve the capacity of schools to promote the healthy development and academic success of each student. The CFL program, developed by Margaret C. Wang at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education, was initially designed as a demonstration program under the aegis of the National Follow Through Program, a compensatory education initiative established by the U.S. Department of Education in the late 1960s. The implementation of the program, then known as the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM), has since been extended to serve students from preschool through high school of varied demographic characteristics in urban, rural, and suburban settings (Wang, 1992). The CFL program has been implemented in schools in over 20 states during the past 25 years, focusing on schools with a high concentration of children from economically and educationally disadvantaged circumstances.

A major design premise of CFL is that nothing can be counted as progress in a community until its children and youth show healthy development and steady, sustained advances in school achievement. Schools must remain the primary focus of all efforts to improve our capacity for education, for other efforts will surely come to naught if schools fail to offer powerful forms of instruction to ensure high standards of academic outcomes for every student. However, significant learning also occurs outside of the school; the conditions for learning, both in school and outside, are established both at home and in the community. Thus, forging radical improvements to achieve student success requires collaboration among stakeholders and the linking of schools with all other learning environments including homes, libraries, museums, the workplace, institutions of higher learning, and community, civic, and social service agencies. Education programs conducted in these environments are coordinated with community revitalization efforts to create a broad-based commitment to improved learning and competence of all children and others who serve them—*in short, a Community for Learning*.

Another underlying premise of CFL's design is that students learn in different ways and require different amounts and varying rates of instruction. Furthermore, it is assumed that effective school programs accommodate and build upon these differences through a variety of instructional methods, alternative learning sequences, and options that are characteristic of the learning needs of individual students. The delivery of adaptive instruction is based upon the use of individualized progress plans, a diagnostic prescriptive monitoring system, and a classroom instructional learning management system that helps students take increasing responsibility for their own behavior and learning progress. Specific interventions are used to enhance each student's ability to acquire basic academic skills and develop social competence and self-esteem. CFL classrooms are inclusive. Students with special needs, including

those classified in special or compensatory education programs, as well as those considered to be academically gifted, receive appropriate instruction without experiencing the negative effects of special labeling or segregation.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Community for Learning program includes five major program components. These include: (1) an instructional program; (2) a site-based management and decision-making process; (3) a family-community involvement program; (4) a school-linked, comprehensive service delivery component; and (5) a data-based staff development program.

- The *instructional* component focuses on a high standard of achievement in basic subjects using a variety of strategies including direct instruction; student-centered exploratory learning in whole-class and small-group settings; student engagement in cooperative learning activities; and one-on-one tutoring. An integrated assessment-instruction process provides individualized learning plans for each student and includes multiple approaches to instruction based on student needs, resources, and expediency. An instructional-learning management program assists students in developing self-responsibility for behaviors and learning progress.
- The *site-based management and shared decision-making process* component is designed to provide an ongoing mechanism for teaming and broad-based participation by the school staff and from parents and the community to develop a site-specific restructuring and improvement plan. This restructuring and improvement plan is based on the needs of students; staff expertise and staffing patterns; curricular standards and assessment; and other concerns.
- The *family-community involvement* component is designed to mobilize and utilize the resources and expertise of families and the community to achieve student learning success.
- The *school-linked, comprehensive service delivery* component focuses on achieving and sustaining the wellness and learning success of each and every student. This component links schools with medical, psychological, legal, recreational, and social service institutions.
- CFL's *data-based staff development program* provides ongoing professional development and technical assistance tailored specifically to the implementation needs of individual staff and to the program implementation requirements that must be met to achieve a high degree of program implementation.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunities to learn

- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
Students with special educational needs/mild-moderate disabilities
Young readers with reading difficulties
ESL or bilingual students
Students in urban and rural schools with a high concentration of students who live in high-poverty circumstances

GRADE LEVELS

The Community for Learning is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades Pre-K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking skills

Hands-on activities
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring teacher/aide and student
Heterogeneous grouping

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Attend to foundation of basic skills
Learning processes
Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
Challenging academic content
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
Kindergarten
Prevention oriented
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
Flexible scheduling
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-specific improvement plan
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

Requests for assistance in implementing the CFL program may be initiated by the school staff or superintendent, or made in response to a statewide reform initiative. Because CFL is a comprehensive approach to school reform, its implementation is carried out as an integral component of the schoolwide improvement plan, with the expectation of participation of the entire school staff. Implementation is a two-step process. First, a comprehensive needs assessment is conducted involving all stakeholder groups; this assessment includes school staff (e.g., regular and special education teachers, school psychologists, and speech pathologists); school and district leadership teams; parents; and community. The second step is the actual

process of implementation planning, which typically involves the school-based personnel who are responsible for program implementation at the school level.

The site-specific implementation plan includes the following key elements:

- Site-specific implementation design that takes into account the school's program improvement needs, the learning characteristics and needs of the students, staff expertise and staffing patterns, curricular standards, and assessment.
- Schoolwide organizational structure that supports a teaming process involving coordination and collaboration among school staff to achieve program coherence and shared responsibility for the learning success of every student.
- Integrated assessment-instruction process that provides an individualized learning plan for each student, includes multiple approaches (e.g., whole-class instruction, small-group instruction, and one-on-one tutoring), and is based on analyses of student needs, resources, and expediency.
- Instructional-learning management program that focuses on the development of student self-responsibility for behaviors and learning progress.
- Data-based staff development program that provides ongoing professional development and technical assistance tailored specifically to the needs of individual staff and to requirements of the program in order to achieve a high degree of program implementation.
- Family and community improvement program to enhance communication between the school and families and to forge community partnerships and connections.
- School-linked comprehensive coordinated health and human services delivery component that focuses on achieving and sustaining the wellness and learning success of every student.

The instructional component of CFL provides critical technical and instructional assistance with the diagnostic-prescriptive process and direct instruction. At the classroom level, CFL utilizes heterogeneous grouping (e.g., multi-age), flexible scheduling, and continuous progress plans. At the school level, the Community for Learning program calls for the use of staffing patterns that promote coordination and collaboration among school staff. Specialized professional staff (e.g., special education teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, and school professionals) work closely with regular education teachers to plan and serve in a variety of implementation support functions.

Pre-implementation and ongoing support for introducing and maintaining CFL is provided through the Data-Based Staff Development Program. This training sequence for school personnel includes three levels. The first, basic training, provides an overview of CFL and a working knowledge of the program's implementation requirements. The second, individualized training, is keyed to particular functions of each staff role. The third, inservice training, consists of an ongoing interactive process of program assessment, feedback, planning, and staff development.

Studies conducted on the CFL program consistently show program feasibility and effectiveness. On-site program facilitators provide ongoing implementation support to meet the training and technical assistance needs of the individual teachers with support from the program developers. One of the CFL implementation requirements is the assignment of a program facilitator at each implementation site by the school district. Facilitators are usually teachers on special projects funded through supplementary programs such as Title I or special education. School staff generally begin to initiate implementation of program components immediately after completion of pre-implementation training. As the degree of program implementation improves, a concomitant pattern of positive changes in classroom processes and teachers' and students' classroom behaviors can be observed.

The overall results on program implication and effects indicate that CFL can be effectively implemented in a variety of classroom settings. CFL implementation is site-specific and closely monitored, which enables the program to be sensitive to student diversity and sustainable over time. The program confers achievement and attitudinal benefits on students. In addition, cost data documents that CFL is cost-effective over time.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Increased student achievement
- Improved student attitudes towards school and learning
- Improved attitudes of teachers towards students and school
- Increased parent involvement in their children's learning
- Increased student-teacher academic interactions
- Increased teacher time spent in small-group instruction and one-on-one tutoring
- Decreased student-teacher interactions for classroom management purposes
- Decreased student discipline problems
- Increased student time in cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and student exploratory activities
- Increased student engagement in learning
- Increased positive interactions among peers
- Increased level of student self-responsibility in managing behavior, academic progress, and classroom learning environment
- Improved ability of schools to meet students' nonacademic needs through coordinated school-linked related services

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The Community for Learning program and its instructional component have been implemented in more than 200 schools in 22 states. Evaluations have been conducted by program staff and by external reviewers (cf. Wang, 1992; Far West Laboratory, 1980; Laboratory for Student Success, 1997). The overall results on program implementation indicate that CFL can be effectively implemented in a variety of classroom settings.

Findings from internal and external evaluations of the Community for Learning program being implemented show well-documented positive changes. The CFL research base reveals that a high degree of implementation of CFL can be achieved at a variety of school sites that differ in geographic and demographic characteristics. CFL teachers, when compared with those not using the program, scored significantly higher on the critical dimensions of effective classroom practices. A high degree of program implementation was found to be related to positive program outcomes (e.g., Brookhart, Casile, & McCown, 1996; Laboratory for Student Success, 1997).

Survey results indicate that CFL teachers' perceptions about their ability to provide for student diversity improved with the implementation of the CFL program. CFL teachers were also observed to have increased the use of instructional materials that are responsive to students' differing ability levels and interests and that encourage collaborative and small-group instruction. Other findings include positive classroom process changes such as reduced teacher time spent on whole-class instruction concomitant with increased one-on-one and small-group instruction. Teachers also spent more time interacting with students for instructional rather than managerial purposes (Wang & Zollers, 1990; Laboratory for Student Success, 1997).

An overall pattern of positive change in student achievement was observed when CFL students were compared with non-CFL students. Achievement scores also suggest that students who participated in the program for a longer period of time performed better than their counterparts who had less time in CFL classes. Students in the program show higher achievement scores and more positive attitudes towards self and school than comparison students, as well as positive classroom behavioral changes (Brookhart, Casile, & McCown, 1996, 1997; Oates, Flores, & Weishew, 1997; Wang & Zollers, 1990). Furthermore, test results of CFL students have compared favorably with district and national norms for students from similar economic and cultural backgrounds (Laboratory for Student Success, 1997).

Data from schools where CFL is implemented as an inclusive program also indicate a consistent pattern of positive student outcomes. Integration of special education students in regular classrooms has resulted in increased recommendations for decertification out of special education (Wang & Birch, 1984; Wang & Zollers, 1990). Key findings in student outcomes include positive attitudinal and academic achievement changes. In addition to higher achievement compared to students in self-contained special education classes, special education students in CFL classrooms rate themselves as equal to general education students in terms of social competence and self-esteem; students in the comparison non-CFL classrooms rate themselves as lower than the general education students in their classes in terms of their overall ratings of self. Program students consistently show increased time on task and greater amounts of instructional interaction with teachers (Wang & Walberg, 1983; Wang, 1985; Wang & Zollers, 1990).

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Brookhart, S. M., Casile, W. J., & McCown, R. (1997). *Evaluation of the implementation of continuous progress instruction in the Fox Chapel Area School District 1995-1996.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University.

Brookhart, S. M., Casile, W. J., & McCown, R. (1996). *Evaluation of the 1995 implementation of continuous progress instruction final report.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University.

Far West Laboratory. (1980). *Educational programs that work (7th Edition).* San Francisco, CA: Author.

Laboratory for Student Success. (1997). *Interim Report: First-Year Implementation of the Community for Learning Whole-School Reform Model.* Philadelphia, PA: Author.

Oates, J., Flores, R., & Weishew, N. (1997). *Achieving student success in inner-city schools is possible, provided...* Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Wang, M. C. (1992). *Adaptive education strategies: Building on diversity.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Wang, M. C. (1985). An analysis of program design implications for teacher and student use of school time. In C. Fisher & D. Berliner (Eds.), *Perspectives on instructional time* (pp. 237-262). White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Wang, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1984). Comparison of a full-time mainstreaming program and a resource room approach. *Exceptional Children, 51*(1), 33-40.

Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1983). Adaptive instruction and classroom time. *American Educational Research Journal, 20*(4), 601-626.

Wang, M. C., & Zollers, N. J. (1990). Adaptive instruction: An alternative service delivery approach. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(1), 7-21.

CORE KNOWLEDGE PROGRAM

Core Knowledge Foundation
2012-B Morton Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Phone: 804-977-7550
Fax: 804-977-0021
Web: www.coreknowledge.org

Core Knowledge Program

Program Overview

The Core Knowledge program presents a curriculum that develops students' cultural literacy by providing important knowledge about history, literature, geography, math, science, art, and music (Hirsch, 1993). This program assumes that all children can learn and are eager to do so. Children need the opportunity to build a strong foundation of shared knowledge in an environment that stresses rigorous content and assessment. The program offers a core curriculum for all students in grades K-6. The program's founder, E.D. Hirsch, believes that while all children can benefit from the program, it is particularly valuable for poor and minority students. Core Knowledge provides schools with a grade-specific curriculum covering basic academic subjects including literature, history, math, science, and the arts. These subjects are meant to comprise 50% of the school's curriculum. The incorporation of this curriculum into the school requires that teachers collaborate with each other at both grade and school level. Also, it requires that schools compare and integrate their state and local curriculum guidelines with the Core Knowledge guidelines. Each school is expected to include lessons of particular interest to its local community. The program views a core of shared knowledge as necessary to achieve excellence and fairness in elementary education.

Program Components

Program components are chiefly comprised of the *Core Knowledge Series*, a set of grade-specific books bringing together the knowledge considered necessary for cultural literacy. For example, the book *What Your Second Grader Needs to Know* (Hirsch, 1991; part of the Core Knowledge Series), provides stories, poems, and myths in its section on language arts. The section on mathematics provides information and sample problems. These books do not provide lesson plans or an outline of a complete curriculum. Sample lesson plans and scope and sequence charts are available. Professional development includes conferences and networking. Teacher networking is encouraged via a foundation newsletter.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

Students Served

All students

Grade Levels

Core Knowledge is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-6.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
* Direct instruction

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment

Attend to foundation of basic skills
Challenging academic content
Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction

* Parent involvement

Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
Kindergarten
Shared school vision

IMPLEMENTATION

The *Core Knowledge Series* for grades K-6 is implemented in three phases. The first phase, "building a consensus," requires school members to review Core Knowledge and assess their desire to implement the program. Parents, teachers, and administrators are encouraged to be part of this phase. Collectively, teachers must compare their current curriculum to the contents of the Core Knowledge curriculum. Schools must also compare state and local guidelines with the Core Knowledge guidelines, aligning the required skills and content. The second phase, "planning," entails studying the *Core Knowledge Series* in detail and developing a curriculum that satisfies both local and state requirements and the *Core Knowledge Series*. Because Core Knowledge comprises only half of the school curriculum, schools must determine the remaining 50 percent. The third phase, "implementing," requires teachers to turn the Core Knowledge guidelines into units and lessons for classroom use. Teacher networks are encouraged for sharing ideas and teaching practices.

Stringfield, Datnow, Nunnery, and Ross (1996) conducted a study of the implementation of Core Knowledge and found the following factors to affect early successful implementation of the program: extra funding for start-up; teachers'

content knowledge; amount of planning time; common planning time for teachers and for parent and community support; site-based management; district support; staff interest, support, and commitment; team teaching and networking with Core Knowledge teachers at other schools; and assistance in finding materials and local adaptation of materials.

The implementation of Core Knowledge has been described from the perspectives of Hawthorne Elementary School teachers (Mentzer & Shaughnessy, 1996) and Trinity University, a collaborating partner (Frazee, 1996). These case studies provide evidence that Core Knowledge can be implemented in schools serving low-income and limited English proficient (LEP) communities. According to one Hawthorne teacher, "Perhaps the most significant change was our adoption of the Core Knowledge Sequence developed by Hirsch" (Mentzer & Shaughnessy, 1996, p. 20). This case study treats the *Core Knowledge Series* as a vehicle for reform but does not attribute the school's academic success to the curriculum alone (Frazee, 1996).

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Possession of a core of essential knowledge by students
- Decreased disparities in amount and kind of knowledge acquired by students
- Increased student engagement in learning
- Decreased disciplinary problems
- Revitalized and intellectually stimulated teachers

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The knowledge base describing the features and effects of the *Core Knowledge Series* is at a stage where new information is being generated through ongoing research and development. *Core Knowledge Series* developers claim that the program's effects are cumulative. Therefore, determining the impact of the program is only now possible because children have received instruction based on the curriculum for several years.

Several studies report improved standardized test scores in reading, writing, and math for Core Knowledge students in schools of varying demographic profiles across the U.S. (Core Knowledge Foundation, n.d.,a; Core Knowledge Foundation, n.d.,b; Marshall, 1996; and Schnubnell, 1996). Core Knowledge (n.d.,a; n.d.,b) also demonstrates a narrowing in test score gaps between students traditionally placed at risk of school failure and those who are not. Stringfield et al. (1996) also found increased student self-confidence, increased interest in reading and writing, and decreased discipline problems at Core Knowledge schools. While studies of Core Knowledge are generally positive and have employed standardized measures of student achievement, they have not consistently and uniformly employed rigorous tools for evaluation (e.g., pre- and post-designs, control groups, and significance testing).

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Core Knowledge Foundation (n.d., a). *Core Knowledge Newsletter*. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Core Knowledge Foundation (n.d., b). *Preliminary evaluation report*. Charlottesville, VA: Author.

Frazee, B. (1996). Hawthorne Elementary School: The university's perspective. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(1), 25-32.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1993, May). The Core Knowledge curriculum—What's behind its success? *Educational Leadership*, 23-30.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (Ed.). (1991). *What your second grader needs to know: Fundamentals of a good second-grade education*. New York: Delta.

Marshall, M. (1996, Fall). Core Knowledge sequence credited in test score boost: Disadvantaged students narrow gap. Common Knowledge: *Core Knowledge Foundation Newsletter*, 3-5.

Mentzer, D., & Shaughnessy, T. (1996). Hawthorne Elementary School: The teachers' perspective. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(1), 13-23.

Schnubnell, G. (1996). Hawthorne Elementary School: The evaluator's perspective. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(1), 33-40.

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Nunnery, J., & Ross, S. (1996). *First year evaluation of the implementation of the Core Knowledge Sequence: Qualitative report*. Charlottesville, VA: Core Knowledge Foundation.

DIFFERENT WAYS OF KNOWING

Galef Institute
11050 Santa Monica Boulevard, 3rd Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90025-3594

Phone: 310-479-8883
Fax: 310-473-9720
Web: www.dwoknet.galef.org/

Different Ways of Knowing

Program Overview

Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) is a reform that builds upon students' multiple intelligences and uses an interdisciplinary social science curriculum to strengthen students' verbal, mathematical, logical, social, and artistic skills (Catterall, 1995).

Established by the Galef Institute of Los Angeles, Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) is a K-6 program for all students, including language minority and disadvantaged students. It assumes that all children learn by active participation and when provided with appropriate opportunities in a positive environment. DWoK capitalizes on students' multiple intelligences, allowing students to develop their artistic, verbal, social, and math skills, as well as their intuitive and logical thinking processes. By integrating social studies, history, reading, writing, math, science, and the arts, this program offers students different ways to learn and demonstrate their knowledge. DWoK emphasizes professional development for teachers. By emphasizing a new conception of teaching and learning and providing the necessary curriculum, the program developers hope to make academic knowledge more integrated and meaningful for students.

Program Components

The curriculum and instruction component of Different Ways of Knowing includes an interdisciplinary curriculum emphasizing arts, social studies, and the students' multiple intelligences. The curriculum is organized around a four-phase learning model that uses "wheels" as its organizing schema: Wheel 1: Exploring What You Already Know; Wheel 2: Getting Smarter Through Research; Wheel 3: Becoming an Expert; and Wheel 4: Making Connections. Participating students problem solve, conduct interviews, engage in group discussions, and use artistic media to learn and demonstrate their knowledge.

DWoK's professional development component is a 3-year course of study for K-6 teachers including annual summer institutes, seminars, and workshops, as well as in-class demonstrations and technical assistance from the Galef Institute. The professional development courses model the kind of hands-on, experiential, constructivist teaching and learning which DWoK promotes. Professional growth opportunities such as fellowships and leadership training, teacher training communications, and other professional connections are also available. One final component includes parents and community members to broaden students' learning experiences.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn

- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

GRADE LEVELS

Different Ways of Knowing is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-6.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students

  Active learning

  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies

  Teacher as facilitator
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Positive classroom climate

  Hands-on activities
* Peer tutoring

  Multiple intelligences

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment

  Attend to foundation of basic skills

  Learning processes

  Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
* Community involvement

IMPLEMENTATION

In 1995-96, 7 states and 376 schools were participants in the Different Ways of Knowing project. The implementation process that these and other schools underwent consists of the following steps. Two 3-day professional development workshops are held to assist teachers in developing the attitudes and skills needed for successful implementation of DWoK. The first of these workshops introduces educators to the philosophical underpinnings of the program and provides them with a hands-on opportunity to become familiar with the child-centered, arts-infused curriculum. The second workshop allows educators to enhance their expertise with the integrated curriculum and its relationship to curriculum planning and student assessment. Technical assistance consultants from the Galef Institute also assist in program planning, establishing school implementation teams, facilitating question and answer meetings, and providing in-class demonstrations.

The program also stresses organizational changes within the school that address issues of power, decision-making authority, and resource distribution from the district to school level. DWoK seeks to improve the status of teachers, establish career ladders, and alter organizational relationships. These organizational changes are part of full implementation.

The program also draws upon the resources of the school's community, inviting the participation of parents and community members. In addition, given its emphasis on dynamics between students and teachers, frequent social and academic interactions are essential to the successful implementation of the program.

Teachers hold high expectations for their students and must maintain a positive classroom environment. Central to DWoK is the creation of a positive learning environment, one in which the students feel confident to express themselves in different ways and the teachers feel equally confident to employ innovative teaching techniques. Because DWoK requires teachers to utilize thematic, integrated teaching and instructional practices, successful implementation requires sustained professional development. One third-party evaluation revealed that much of the initiative for professional development rests with the local school district, rather than with the Galef Institute (Catterall, Dreyfuss, & DeJarnette, 1995).

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Improved student performance on standardized language arts and social studies assessments
- Improved student attitudes towards school
- Improved self-confidence as learners
- Increased student sense of the value of personal effort
- Increased student use of independent learning strategies

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Several evaluation studies have been completed for this program. Three studies report that Different Ways of Knowing has a positive impact on student learning (Catterall, 1995; Catterall, Dreyfuss, & DeJarnette, 1995; The Galef Institute, n.d.), as demonstrated by increased scores on standardized language arts tests, social studies content assessments, and state-level assessments (e.g., Kentucky Instructional Results Information System) in the areas of language arts, social studies, and mathematics. Also, these studies showed that attitudes of Different Ways of Knowing students toward school and learning were positive and remained so during the elementary years. Catterall (1995) showed statistically significant and positive associations of teaching behaviors with student motivation and learning. Neither of the other two studies yielded statistically significant results.

Begun in 1992, Different Ways of Knowing has been implemented in schools for a relatively short period of time. Consequently, it is impressive that three third-party evaluations of this program have been completed. Of the studies reported here, two conducted by Catterall and his associates at UCLA and one by researchers at the University of Louisville show that the program does have an impact on student learning.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Catterall, J. (1995). *Different Ways of Knowing 1991-1994: National longitudinal study final report program effects on students and teachers. Executive Summary*. Los Angeles: Galef Institute.

Catterall, J., Dreyfuss, J., & DeJarnette, K., (1995). *How can Different Ways of Knowing impact a learning community? A summary of the Rosemead School District: 1994-1995 Evaluation*. Los Angeles: Galef Institute.

The Galef Institute (n.d.). *Different Ways of Knowing: Results from two nationally recognized studies*. Los Angeles: Author.

48

HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills)

Education Innovations
2302 E. Speedway
Tucson, AZ 85719

Phone: 520-795-2143
Fax: 520-795-8837
Web: www.hots.org/

HOTS

Program Overview

HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills) is a pullout program designed to develop students' higher order thinking skills. It uses technology and Socratic methods to replace the drill and practice approach used in many Title I programs (Pogrow, 1995a). HOTS is designed to assist students at risk of school failure by improving their general thinking and basic skills while simultaneously boosting their social confidence. The program strives to replace the traditional drill and practice approach to remediation with higher order thinking activities for Title I or mildly impaired learning disabled (LD) students in grades 4-8. It is also used for enrichment with gifted students in grades K-2. The HOTS lessons employ computers, specially designed curricular materials, and Socratic teaching strategies. Currently, schools in 49 states are using HOTS as part of their Title I or LD programs.

For a typical HOTS lesson, students are pulled out of regular classrooms for 35 to 45 minutes for 3-5 days a week and receive instruction in a classroom equipped with computers. The number of minutes of instruction and the frequency of lessons depends on students' grade levels. The scripted lesson is led by a specially trained teacher who coordinates the computer activities with class conversations and asks questions that enhance key thinking skills: metacognition, inferencing, synthesizing, and generalizing. During the first part of the period, the teacher engages students in sophisticated conversation using Socratic questioning. The students are then given a problem to solve on the computer, after which they participate in a discussion of how they approached the problem and why their strategy did or did not work. HOTS instruction extends over two years.

Program Components

The main component of HOTS is a 35-minute daily pullout program. Another component supporting the program is teacher training. Generally, each school trains one teacher and one paraprofessional; however, larger schools may train two or three teachers. Teacher training involves attendance at a one-week regional workshop with follow-up training. Teachers learn Socratic questioning and how to encourage students' independent thinking. Successful implementation of HOTS also depends on principals' support and encouragement.

The technical assistance component of the HOTS program includes informal site visits by program developers, phone consultations for teachers via a toll-free number, the HOTSTUFF newsletter, and other materials. Another significant component of HOTS is the curriculum, which includes lessons and computer software. The curriculum materials, such as scripted lessons, can be used alongside any textbook, curriculum, or instructional strategy. Content remediation and worksheets are not employed. The method used in the HOTS educational software is called Learning Dramas. This computer software creates a learning environment where students acquire new information using discovery activities.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

Students Served

Title I students
Students with special needs/mild-moderate disabilities

Grade Levels

HOTS is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-8.

Program Practices

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

Classroom Practices

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
  Teacher models higher order thinking skills
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Tutoring teacher/aide and student
  Use of technology

Curriculum and Assessment

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
  Challenging academic content

School Organization and Climate

* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Small class size
  Pullout for instruction

Implementation

In the initial phases of implementation of the HOTS program, teachers attend a 5-day training workshop on the use of Socratic technique. The workshop is generally held during the summer, although it can also be offered during the school year.

There are explicit requirements for the successful implementation of a HOTS classroom. There is a set maximum pupil-teacher ratio of 1:10 per period, unless an aide is also present, in which case the maximum number of students can be up to 14 per period. Schools must also have one computer per student. Title I and learning disabled students should be scheduled for a minimum of 35 minutes (with an additional 3-5 minute break) 4-5 days a week for the first year, and 5 days a week during the second year. Students should complete the second year even if they test out of the program at the end of the first year. HOTS should be the only compensatory service provided to the students. Students should not be pulled out during math and reading periods, and they must get direct instruction in these subjects every day. An optional fifth day for math drill activities will maximize math gains. At the elementary level, block scheduling should be used to coordinate students with other pullouts so there is only one pullout per classroom per day. At the middle school level, HOTS should constitute one complete period in the day. Talented and gifted students should have three (35-45 minute) sessions per week. To increase test scores, students can have a more intense schedule, attending sessions 4 days a week. Teachers are responsible for pacing students as they move through the ungraded curriculum in a sequential manner. No management or grading systems are used, and there are no formal assessments except those required by Title I programs.

A week-long workshop is used to train HOTS teachers to shift from traditional teaching approaches (such as lecturing and linear presenting of content) to more open-ended, Socratic coaching techniques. Results of implementation studies reveal that only 11% of new teachers trained in HOTS are not able to teach the program as designed. Ratings of HOTS workshops by teachers-in-training reveal that, on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being outstanding, workshops receive an average rating of 1.2. Other implementation data reveal the longevity of the program. Of the 186 schools that implemented the program in 1989, at least 149 still employed the program in 1993; of the 403 sites that implemented the program in 1990, 286 still employed HOTS (Pogrow, 1995b).

Expected Program Outcomes

- Increased student confidence in their ability to solve problems
- Increased learning and academic success

- Enhanced student mastery of basic skills
- Decreased need for student remediation
- Increased use of logical thinking and problem solving strategies (e.g., greater willingness to disconfirm original hypotheses, increased ability to see relationships among concepts, increased ability to consider more information while solving a problem)
- Greater willingness to take risks during problem solving

PROGRAM EFFECTS

A well-executed third-party evaluation of the effects of HOTS on fourth- and fifth-grade students (Eisenman, 1995) examined the impact of HOTS on students' self-concepts, reading achievement, and higher order thinking skills using a pretest-posttest contrast group design. Results revealed that HOTS was more effective in raising students' self-concepts and in two of the higher-order thinking skills (sequential synthesizing and analysis of attributes) at the fifth-grade level. These differences were statistically significant. Both HOTS and Title I raised student achievement scores, but there were no significant differences between the groups. Eisenman concluded that the HOTS program was more effective after 2 years.

The HOTS program was approved by the National Diffusion Network (NDN) in 1989 and was revalidated in 1996. The original NDN program review revealed that HOTS students attained larger gains in basic skills in reading and mathematics than did students in the control group. Using criterion-referenced data from Detroit schools, HOTS students exceeded national averages in reading and mathematics and exhibited greater gains than comparison groups. The differences between HOTS students and control students were not statistically significant. In the NDN revalidation, additional evidence revealed that HOTS students made significantly greater progress—almost twice as much—in fourth- and fifth-grade reading and fourth-grade math. No significance tests were calculated. HOTS also presented evidence from Plymouth, Massachusetts. Although no statistical tests of significance were conducted, HOTS students' scores increased by 15 percentiles, while control students' thinking skills increased by 1 percentile during the year. In San Diego, HOTS was linked to transferring academic gains and increasing students' GPA and membership on the honor roll, as compared to a control group at the fourth and fifth grade levels. In Soldotna, Alaska there was evidence of pre- and posttest gains among HOTS students on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The HOTS students' test results revealed approximately twice the growth that the Title I control students displayed. In Texas, the percentage of HOTS students passing the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) test dramatically increased between 1994 and 1995. Prior to the implementation of HOTS, only 8% of Title I fifth graders passed the TAAS in reading and 38% in mathematics. In 1995, after HOTS was implemented, 47% passed the TAAS reading exam, and 61% passed the mathematics exam.

The HOTS program also submitted evidence to NDN of transfer effects. Program developers argued that substantial gains in students' learning and thinking, as

demonstrated by improved mathematics scores with little or no supplementary mathematics, were a product of participating in HOTS. Evidence of effectiveness was also demonstrated through teacher reports of students' academic improvement, increases in the numbers of HOTS students in gifted programs, numbers of HOTS students on honor rolls, and teacher anecdotal reports of students' increased articulation and self-confidence.

Darmer (1995) revealed the positive effects of HOTS training. On five of six measures, Darmer collected pre- and posttest data and employed a control group. The experimental group was composed largely of Native American students. The control group was composed largely of Hispanic students who received Title I services. These students attended pullout classes once a week and received the balance of their services in the classroom. The experimental and control groups did not differ statistically in their initial reading differences. Darmer (1995) revealed significant differences between the control and HOTS students at the fourth and fifth grade levels in reading comprehension and writing. HOTS students showed significant pre to post gains in novel problem-solving tasks, cognitive thinking (synthesis and analysis), and metacognition. Based on this data, Darmer concluded that HOTS produces gains in academic and higher order thinking skills.

Related Publications

Darmer, M. A. (1995). *Developing transfer and metacognition in educationally disadvantaged students: Effects of the Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Eisenman, J. G., Jr. (1995). *An evaluation of the Higher Order Thinking Skills Program with fourth and fifth grade students*. Unpublished manuscript.

Pogrow, S. (1995a, February). Making reform work for the educationally disadvantaged. *Educational Leadership*, *52*(5), 20-24.

Pogrow, S. (1995b, November). *A revalidation of the effectiveness of the HOTS program*. Submitted to the PEP Committee of the National Diffusion Network. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona.

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT

University of California
5511 Tolman Hall #1670
Berkeley, CA 94720-1670

Phone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-0963
Web: www-gse.berkeley.edu/Research/NWP/nwp.html

NATIONAL WRITING PROJECT

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The National Writing Project (NWP) is designed to improve student writing by providing professional development opportunities to teachers and stressing the role of the teacher as expert (Smith, 1996). Using a "teachers teaching teachers" model, the National Writing Project is a collaborative university-school staff development program to improve the teaching and learning of writing in classrooms nationwide. The program accomplishes this goal using two methods: (a) by providing professional development for classroom teachers, and (b) by expanding the professional role of teachers. The latter method includes identifying and preparing a corps of teachers who can effectively teach other teachers in successful approaches to writing instruction. These teachers share their practical knowledge base, a source of insight into the writing process that is valued by NWP as much as the formal knowledge base of research on writing. Initiated in 1973, NWP grew from a single project site, the University of California-Berkeley's Bay Area Writing Project, to a network of 176 university-school projects in 45 U.S. states, Puerto Rico, Canada, and Europe.

While local Writing Projects are designed by area educators to meet the site-specific needs of schools, some general characteristics are common to most classrooms. One characteristic is the view of writing as a process involving several stages (prewriting, drafting, peer editing and revising, and publishing). NWP teachers encourage students' creativity and fluency and encourage them to use writing as a means of learning and thinking. They hold conferences with students about their writing, focusing on students' ideas while saving comments about grammar and style for the final revising stages. They invite students to evaluate their own writing and to become more conscious of their strengths and weaknesses as writers. Finally, teachers engage in writing themselves, share their writing with students, and model the process of revising.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

NWP is made up of university-school partnerships that are for the most part administered from the university campus. The site directors, with some exceptions, are professors of English or education, while codirectors are classroom teachers. These partnerships between university professors and classroom teachers act as sponsors for summer institutes on the teaching of writing for teachers from kindergarten through university in all subject areas. Because the experience of writing is considered central to the development of good writing teachers, summer institutes model effective writing practices and require participants to write and share their own work with other teachers in the institute. Graduates of the summer institute are considered NWP Teacher Consultants, which means that they are capable of leading inservice workshops with other teachers in their schools and districts.

In addition to summer institutes, NWP provides continuing education for classroom teachers. Examples of these programs include monthly Saturday seminars on writing instruction, advanced summer institutes, teacher research programs (e.g., writing in the primary grades), regional and state conferences, and university seminar series.

NWP also includes an evaluation component. Each NWP site conducts an annual evaluation using information from multiple sources to determine the program's impact. Sources of data for these evaluations include written comments by teachers attending summer institutes and inservice programs, pre- and postholistic student assessment procedures, student portfolios of writing, case studies, and ethnographies. Several of these evaluations have been published. (National Writing Project, 1983; Stokes & St. John, 1992).

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

GRADE LEVELS

The National Writing Project is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking skills
  Hands-on activities

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Integration of content areas

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

  Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Community involvement
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
  Encourage action research

IMPLEMENTATION

The National Writing Project relies on teaching teachers to improve writing instruction at the classroom level. The process begins with a summer institute. Participants for NWP summer institutes are selected on the basis of their success as teachers of writing and for their promise as teachers of teachers. Graduates of the summer institute are then responsible for conducting local inservice writing instruction with other teachers from their schools and districts. Teachers attending these local inservice workshops then implement NWP ideas about writing instruction in their classrooms.

Numerous studies have examined the implementation of the National Writing Project, with the great majority of these studies finding that NWP is well-received by teachers and does have an impact on teacher practices. Bratcher and Stroble's (1994) study of the effects of the summer institute on 69 public school teachers noted that teachers became more knowledgeable about writing as a process and confident in their ability to implement NWP strategies. Teachers participating in NWP also reported that changes in their classroom practices included students writing for audiences other than themselves, greater use of a variety of prewriting strategies, and teachers engaging in their own writing. The researchers also noted, however, that while the summer institute did provide teachers with new strategies for teaching, it did not help them define successful student writing.

Using teacher self-report data, Pritchard (1987) found that teachers increased the amount of time they spent on writing instruction after attending the summer institute. Stander's (1985) survey of the Oakland and Macomb NWP teachers found that at least half had adopted an NWP technique such as response groups for peer editing of student writing and sharing ideas for writing with colleagues. An earlier study by Thomas (1979), in which NWP teachers were interviewed, showed that the teachers reported changes in their classroom practices and in their course emphases that were in line with NWP practices. Stahlecker (1979) concluded, in a study of the

long-term effects of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), that "a majority of teachers (in most cases more than 75%) see the BAWP experience as having increased their ability to relate theory to practice in the teaching of writing, their efficiency as a writer, their confidence in teaching writing, and their level of skill in teaching writing" (p. 23). While NWP has documented implementation effects, its impact on student writing is less clear.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Improved student writing
- Increased student confidence and enjoyment of writing
- Improved instruction of writing
- Expanded professional roles for teachers (teachers as writers, teachers as teachers of other teachers)

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The National Writing Project has a history of evaluation, both at local project sites and on the national level. Several evaluators have looked at outcomes for student learning (Pritchard, 1987; Haughen, 1982; Alloway et al., 1979). More typically, NWP evaluations focus for the most part on teacher effects, including attitudes towards the program, use of NWP strategies to teach writing, and teacher perceptions of students' attitudes toward and ability for writing (Bratcher & Stroble, 1994; Stahlecker, 1979; Thomas & Keech, 1979; Thomas & Watson, 1979).

Effects of NWP on teachers that have been demonstrated by research studies include teacher acceptance of NWP strategies (Thomas & Watson, 1979); teacher perceptions of increased student enjoyment, valuing of, and confidence in writing (Stahlecker, 1979); teacher reports of increased confidence and ability to teach writing (Stahlecker, 1979; Thomas & Keech, 1979); increased conversations with colleagues about writing (Stahlecker, 1979); teacher reports of their own improved writing (Stahlecker, 1979); thinking of writing as a process, and using Project teaching strategies (Bratcher & Stroble, 1994; Thomas & Keach, 1979). Pritchard (1987) also noted a "spin-off" effect, where students in classrooms led by teachers who were colleagues of NWP teachers but who had not participated in NWP themselves did better than students who had teachers without NWP experience or colleagues with such experience. According to Bratcher and Stroble (1994), NWP did not help teachers define successful student writing, while Thomas and Keech (1979) claim that teachers expected higher quality writing from students and employed more consistent standards for evaluating student writing.

The evaluations of National Writing Project programs vary in rigor. Some included pre- and posttest designs (Pritchard, 1987; Alloway et al., 1979), while most did not. The same is true for studies with control groups. Pritchard (1987), Haughen (1982), and Alloway et al. (1979) included control groups against which to compare learning by students in classrooms whose teachers attended NWP summer institutes.

Pritchard (1987), Haughen (1982), and Alloway et al. (1979) tested for significance and found significantly better writing by students in classrooms where teachers attended an NWP summer institute compared to students in classrooms where teachers had not. Pritchard (1987) noted that the effects were greatest at the elementary level and smallest at the high school level.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Alloway, E., Carroll, J., Emig, J., King, B., Marcotrigiano, I., Smith, J., & Spicer, W. (1979, February). *Report to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.* Unpublished manuscript.

Bratcher, S., & Stroble, E. J. (1994). Determining the progression from comfort to confidence: A longitudinal evaluation of a National Writing Project using site-based multiple data sources. *Research in the Teaching of English, 28*(1), 66-88.

Haughen, N. S. (1982). *An investigation of the impact of the Wisconsin Writing Project on student composition.* Unpublished manuscript.

National Writing Project. (1983). *NWP Evaluation Portfolio.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, National Writing.

Pritchard, R. J. (1987). Effects on student writing of teacher training in the National Writing Project model. *Written Communication, 4*(1), 51-67.

Smith, M. S. (1996, June). The National Writing Project after 22 years. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 688-691.

Stahlecker, J. (1979). *Long term follow-up report of four Bay Area Writing Programs. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, National Writing Project.

Stander, A. C. (1985, March). *Evaluating the effects of the Oakland Writing Project on teacher behaviors and attitudes: A preliminary study.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, MN.

Stokes, L., & St. John, J. (1992). *Summary of program evaluations, 1991-1992: Evidence of program effectiveness.* Berkeley, CA: University of California, National Writing Project.

Thomas, S. (1979). *Teacher interview report. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project: A technical report.* Unpublished manuscript.

Thomas, S., & Keech, C. (1979). *Field studies report. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project: A technical report.* Unpublished manuscript.

Thomas, S., & Watson, P. (1979). *Critical competitors. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project: A technical report.* The Carnegie Corporation.

PAIDEIA

National Paideia Center
School of Education
CB #8045
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8045

Phone: 919-962-7379
Fax: 919-962-7381
Web: www.paideiaschool.org/

PAIDEIA

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Paideia is a rigorous liberal arts program designed to develop students' minds through a curriculum stressing canonical works, didactic instruction, Socratic questioning, and coaching. In *The Paideia Proposal* (Adler, 1983), Mortimer Adler argued that a truly democratic society is responsible for providing a high quality, basic education to all its members. Basic education should include acquiring information and organized knowledge, developing intellectual skills, and expanding one's understanding of the world. To this end, Paideia seeks to provide a rigorous liberal arts education for all students in grades K-12 so they can earn a living, think, act critically as responsible citizens, and engage in life-long learning. This education should be nonspecialized and nonvocational. For Adler, the basics include fine arts, geography, history, language, literature, mathematics, natural science, and social science.

In Paideia classrooms, teachers hold high expectations for students, model higher order thinking skills, and encourage students to complete an academically rigorous program. Using seminars, teachers lead students in the study of canonical works, engage them in Socratic dialogue about the content of those works, and develop students' logical thinking skills. While Paideia classrooms are most often associated with Socratic seminars, they also incorporate strategies such as the use of laboratories, cooperative learning, project-centered/product-oriented learning, and whole-class instruction.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Under Paideia, teachers and students engage in rigorous curriculum and instruction, the central component of the program. The curriculum is based on great works or canonical knowledge. Instructional methods include didactic instruction, coaching, exercises, and supervised practice in addition to Socratic questioning and active participation. A teacher training component at the National Paideia Center instructs teachers in the use of Paideia seminars and other teaching strategies.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

GRADE LEVELS

Paideia is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking skills

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Authentic assessments
* Integration of content areas
  Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

  School restructuring
  Flexible scheduling
* Small class size

IMPLEMENTATION

Paideia is implemented on a schoolwide level. Scheduling is altered to allow for the extra time needed for seminars and to reduce the number of students in a classroom to allow for teacher coaching.

The first instructional method introduced to the schools and teachers as part of the implementation process is usually the seminar. Teachers are trained in this method at the National Paideia Center. Students and teachers find that skills in seminars transfer to their other subjects, improving attitudes and motivation. Teachers also learn other pedagogical techniques that are used in Paideia, including Socratic dialogue and logical thinking skills, and how to motivate students to actively participate in class.

As reported in *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children* (Stringfield et al., 1997), Paideia implementation can be uneven. Using information from four program sites, the researchers identified the following factors that contribute to uneven implementation: flexibility of the program (e.g. what constitutes didactic instruction), its abstract nature, and the significant investment in professional development. Additional factors found to positively affect implementation included: flexible scheduling to allow seminars and individual coaching; adaptation of the curriculum to meet a wide range of student abilities; a sense of communal engagement with Paideia among all stakeholders; presence and effectiveness of a school-site Paideia coordinator; low staff turnover; parent involvement; and access to a library of "great books."

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Increased student ability to think critically, understand ideas, solve problems, and make decisions
- Improved student writing, speaking, and listening skills
- Improved student attitudes and motivation towards learning and school

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Four research studies (Stringfield et al. 1994; Dreyden, MacPhail-Wilcox, & Eason, 1991; Brazil, 1984; Wallace, 1993) that varied in their approaches and purposes concluded that the Paideia program may have a positive impact on participating students. However, there is little information available regarding the actual impact of the program on student learning outcomes. Three studies revealed increased positive attitudes of the Paideia students through such effects as higher levels of student engagement in learning (Stringfield et al, 1994); reading enjoyment and more active classroom participation (Brazil, 1984); and improved student skill and affect (Wallace, 1993).

Dreyden et al. (1991) compared critical thinking for similar Paideia and non-Paideia students at a large suburban high school. Using results from the Cornell Test of Critical Thinking (CTCT) administered at the beginning and end of the academic year, they found that mean scores of non-Paideia students showed no significant difference from pre- to posttest. On the other hand, they found that the mean posttest scores of Paideia students declined from mean pretest scores. In particular, CTCT posttest scores of Paideia students were lower on inductive reasoning subtests. The authors suggest that the CTCT may not have been an adequate means of measuring critical thinking skills of students in Paideia, in particular holistic types of thinking.

Wallace (1993) revealed that Paideia students, compared to non-Paideia students at the same 23 urban high schools, had higher average daily attendance (84-91% vs.

78-85%). Eleven percent of Paideia students scored in the bottom quartile in reading comprehension, mathematics problem solving, and science on the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), compared to 33-66% of non-Paideia students. Paideia elementary students had lower failure rates in English, math, and science (3.6%) compared to non-Paideia elementary students (4.3%). In addition, the Paideia program assisted students in better expressing and supporting their ideas on tests of writing. In surveys, Paideia students expressed positive attitudes towards Paideia pedagogy and their teachers; their own ability to learn, think, and write; their ability to understand themselves; and their ability to understand and work with others better. Similarly, teachers reported high student interest in readings, frequent participation in discussions, and improved student skills and affect. Finally, 80% of parents wanted their children to remain in the program, believing that Paideia enhanced their child's reading ability, thinking, speaking, self-esteem, and enthusiasm for learning.

Brazil (1984) compared students recruited to the Paideia program and students from a comparable school in terms of race, size, percentage of low-income students, standardized achievement scores, and budget allocation within the district. This evaluation looked at student and teacher perceptions via questionnaires. Students who responded to the classroom survey in the spring of 1984 and the spring of 1985 indicated that "positive changes in behaviors directly related to the Socratic seminar were taking place" and that students were having "active discussions in their classrooms more often than was reported by the non-Paideia students in the comparison school" (Brazil, 1984, p. 146). There were no differences in the perceptions of Paideia and non-Paideia students regarding coaching, teacher enthusiasm, and supervised practice. Brazil attributes the differences reported between the Paideia and non-Paideia schools to the use of the Socratic method.

Teacher responses to the questionnaire revealed the following patterns. A larger percentage of Paideia teachers reported having discussion in their classes and that they usually encouraged their students to share ideas and discuss different opinions. Paideia teachers were also more likely to ask students to provide evidence to support their in-class responses. In general, Paideia teachers were less likely to work with students in small groups. Also, Paideia teachers more frequently spent time coaching students than did comparison teachers, but in other areas, such as enthusiasm, there were no meaningful differences.

In efforts to evaluate student achievement, researchers intended to examine the performance of Paideia students on the citywide Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP); however, no posttest data was available. Analysis of second semester failure rates in reading, mathematics, and social studies revealed a greater frequency of failure for the comparison students than for Paideia students.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Adler, M. (1983). *The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Brazil, R. (1988). *The engineering of the Paideia proposal: The first year, 1984-85.* Champaign, IL: School Design Group.

Dreyden, J. I., MacPhail-Wilcox, B., & Eason, E. (1991). Changes in critical thinking skills: Outcomes of the Paideia curriculum as measured by item analysis. *Journal of Research in Education, 1*(1). 26-34.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M., Puma, M., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children, first year report* (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Stringfield, S., Herman, R., Brigham, N., Nesselrodt, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Levin, M., & Stevens, R., with Gamse, B., Puma, M., Rosenblum, S., Beaumont, J., Randall, B., & Smith, L. (1997). *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children.* (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Wallace, T. (1993). Chicago Public Schools: Evaluation of the 1987-88 Paideia program. In D. R. Waldrip, W. L. Marks, & N. Estes (Eds.), *Magnet school policy studies and evaluations.* (pp. 477-515). Houston, TX: International Research Institute on Educational Choice.

READING RECOVERY

Ohio State University
29 W. Woodruff Avenue
Ramseyer Hall, Rm. 209
Columbus, OH 43210

Phone: 614-688-3646
Fax: 614-292-4260

READING RECOVERY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Reading Recovery is a pullout program that provides one-on-one tutoring by highly trained teachers to kindergarten and first-grade students with reading problems so that they may read at grade level and continue improving without further remediation (Pinnell, 1996). Using early intervention with special literacy instruction, Reading Recovery seeks to helps students who have difficulty reading. It is designed to help the lowest achieving readers make faster-than-average progress so they can catch up with their classmates and avoid further remediation. The program is available for English- and Spanish-speaking students and includes a lengthy and intensive professional development process for the school's Reading Recovery teacher. Children from the lowest 20% of their class are pulled out of the regular classroom for intensive one-on-one instruction for 30 minutes a day for 12-20 weeks. Reading Recovery instruction begins with two weeks of "roaming around the known" activities designed to enhance students' strengths as readers. Subsequent instructional activities include: reading familiar stories, working with letters or words, writing a story, and reading a new book. Parental involvement is also a vital part of Reading Recovery, and parents are expected to read along with their child at home. After 12-20 weeks, most children are discontinued from the program. Over 110,000 students in North America have participated in Reading Recovery since 1985, when it was first introduced from New Zealand. The program's North American headquarters are at Ohio State University in Columbus, OH.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Thirty-minute periods of daily reading instruction form the core of Reading Recovery's instructional component. Teacher training is also an essential component of the program. Educators participate in a full year of university-based training followed by ongoing professional development. Reading Recovery's intensive teaching training program and its professional development activities are based upon seven key principles:

- Practice is the foundation of each teacher's concept and theory development.
- Interaction with peers provides support for and is a source of learning.
- Teaching and learning are strategic activities.
- Adults learn by closely observing teaching and learning.
- Effective learners are independent.
- Learners should be challenged, but not to the extent that they become anxious or frustrated.
- Learners need to reflect on their learning and articulate what they knew before and what they are going to learn.

An early literacy network forms another component of Reading Recovery. Network activities include research, publications, and professional development. Research

and evaluation, another Reading Recovery component, are conducted on a regular basis to ensure the program's effectiveness.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Increase family involvement
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

STUDENTS SERVED

Young readers with reading difficulties
ESL or bilingual students

GRADE LEVELS

Reading Recovery is a curricular reform program implemented in grades Pre-K-1.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Tutoring teacher/aide and student

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Tailored to student cultural background
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
Prevention oriented
Pullout for instruction

IMPLEMENTATION

Reading Recovery is implemented at the district level. In 1995-1996, there were approximately 475 Reading Recovery sites, comprised of 2,700 school districts. It generally takes a school district or consortium of districts 2 years to implement a site—1 year to have a teacher trained as a teacher leader and a second year to establish a local training site. To become an approved site, the district or consortium applies to a university regional training center to have its teacher trained after it has secured financial support within the district, obtained approval of the district superintendent, and reached an agreement with a local university or college to award graduate credit to the teacher who will be trained. A site coordinator is selected to oversee the preparation of the facility, manage the budget, and act as administrative liaison with the Reading Recovery network.

There are five components to teacher training in the Reading Recovery program. These include: a graduate level curriculum; daily teaching of four Reading Recovery students; field requirements, including site visits to observe experienced Reading Recovery teachers; preparation for implementing Reading Recovery at their own schools; and attendance at professional development conferences, institutes, and meetings. After the training year, teacher leaders and site coordinators work together to maintain the site. Teacher leaders train new teachers, collect data, and prepare annual site reports. Teachers in training continue to work full-time in their school district as they receive instruction in Reading Recovery procedures. The most common arrangement is for the teacher to spend a half day teaching Reading Recovery students and the other half performing other assigned duties. Teachers work with a minimum of four students daily.

The document *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children* (Stringfield et al., 1997) includes results of several Reading Recovery case studies designed to ascertain whether successful implementation of Reading Recovery varied by distance from the training site. Two case studies were conducted at schools in rural sites. The first site was located near Ohio State University, the national training headquarters for the program. The second site was in a northwestern state which was less likely to be as closely monitored. Both sites received needed assistance from the Reading Recovery national headquarters, and, for those sites at a distance from Columbus, the State Department of Education provided supplemental assistance.

Stringfield et al. (1997) identified two factors that negatively affected implementation. The first of these is the existence of conflict between instructional

strategies used by Reading Recovery teachers and those used by regular classroom teachers. Researchers determined that program impact may be increased if the two teaching strategies coincide. Second, Reading Recovery teachers varied the amount of time devoted to the program. For example, one teacher asked students to come in during recess to extend the amount of instructional time, while another covered fewer books per session. Researchers also determined that a Reading Recovery teacher's cooperative, nonevaluative attitude will facilitate the program's acceptance and successful implementation.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- After 12-20 weeks, children attain an average or better-than-average reading level of performance.
- Students' reading performance continues improving so that future remediation is unnecessary.

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Many studies have been done on the Reading Recovery program, including primary research studies, internal evaluations, third-party evaluations, research summaries, and cost studies (Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred, & McNaught, 1995; Curry, Griffith, & Williams, 1995; Donley, Baenen, & Hundley, 1993; Gregory, Earl, & O'Donoghue, 1994; Grossen, Coulter, & Ruggles, 1996; Herman & Stringfield, 1997; Hiebert, 1994; Leitner, 1990; National Diffusion Network, 1993; Pinnell, 1996; Pinnell, 1989; Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988; Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994; Reading Recovery National Data Evaluation Center, 1997; Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Smith-Burke, Jaggar, & Ashdown, 1993; Swartz, 1992; Swartz & Klein, 1994; Swartz, Shook, & Hoffman, 1993; Wake County Public School System, 19[illegible]).

Reading Recovery has a rigorous research component that continuously collects program results and provides feedback to teachers and schools. Swartz and Klein (1994) identify the most salient results:

- Reading Recovery serves the lowest 20% of first-grade readers. Of this quintile, about 75-85% will achieve reading and writing scores that are average for children in their class (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988; National Diffusion Network, 1993; Swartz, Shook, & Hoffman, 1993).
- Children served by Reading Recovery will sustain their progress in reading and writing for up to 3 years after discontinuation from the Reading Recovery program (Pinnell, 1989; Smith-Burke et al., 1993).
- Reading Recovery is more effective in achieving short-term gains and enduring effects on reading and writing than other early intervention programs targeted to help students at risk of school failure. This includes programs that are one-on-one tutorials and/or employ small-group methods (Pinnell et al., 1994; Gregory et al., 1993).

- Reading Recovery is cost effective in comparison to remedial reading, special education placement, and grade retention (Dyer, 1992; Swartz, 1992).

Despite the extensive knowledge base provided by program developers, other researchers have challenged the claims and long-term effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program. Shanahan and Barr (1995) have suggested a bias in the manner in which some statistics are reported in many of the program's evaluations. The authors point to the presentation of data concerning discontinued students, stating that a substantial percentage of children's incompletion goes unexplained. The authors further conclude that by not reporting the data on these students, the results are positively biased toward Reading Recovery gains. Reading Recovery has an immediate relative advantage over other early reading interventions, but as students progress through the grade levels, this advantage diminishes. As students advance to second and third grade, there is an increase in variation in students' reading scores, and students' rate of progress is slow compared to that of regular students. The benefit of having participated in Reading Recovery is no longer statistically significant. Shanahan and Barr (1995) conclude that, once students attain the average performance level in first grade, their progress in subsequent grades is less. Thus, these students may need ongoing assistance.

Donley et al. (1993) examined the rates of special education, Chapter 1 placements, and grade retentions among Wake County's Reading Recovery students. They reported that there were fewer special education placements in the 1990-91 cohort of Reading Recovery students, but not for the 1991-92 cohort. The 1990-91 cohort had significantly lower Chapter 1 placement rates (data on Chapter 1 placement rates was only available on the 1990-91 cohort). The Reading Recovery students in the 1991-92 cohort also had lower retention rates, but not those in the 1990-91 cohort. These results, while suggestive of Reading Recovery effectiveness, were for the most part not statistically significant, nor were complete data sets available for analysis. In a second study, no significant differences were found in the need for grade retention, special education, or Title I services between Reading Recovery students and non-Reading Recovery students. The evaluators conclude that, as implemented, Reading Recovery cannot maintain Wake County low achievers reading at grade level.

Leitner (1990) reported results of a survey of homeroom teachers whose students participated in the Reading Recovery program (21 teachers returned the survey, for a 91% return rate.) Teachers said that parents made positive comments about the Reading Recovery program. Teachers also reported an "improvement in skills, self-esteem, and responsibility" of students in the program. Twenty, or 95%, of the teachers reported that Reading Recovery teachers did at least an average job of communicating with them about students progress, and 12, or 57% of them, thought there was a "great deal" of communication with the Reading Recovery teachers. Fifteen of 17 homeroom teachers (87%) stated that successfully discontinued students were reading at a level similar to that of average students. Approximately half of

72

the homeroom teachers believed that Reading Recovery supported their own teaching strategies and was useful in their classes. Questionnaires were also sent to parents of Reading Recovery students. The parent survey had a return rate of only 47% (n = 26). Parents stated that the program helped their children's reading and self-esteem, and 81% (n = 21) rated Reading Recovery a "5" on a 5-point scale, labeling it "very good." Fifty percent (n = 13) of parents said they read with their children more after the program.

Some research on the effectiveness of Reading Recovery has raised questions about the program's effects and costs. For example, two researchers at the University of Oregon and the Vice President of an Illinois school (Grossen et al., 1996) found that the cost for the 30 hours of instruction is more than the national average per pupil expenditure for one year of school. Estimates of costs to produce one successful Reading Recovery student run as high as $9,211. The authors determined that a school could spend more than $125,000 to put 20 students in Reading Recovery, and only one would be reading at grade level in authentic texts by the end of the year. They also cite Fincher's (1991) finding that teaching assistants with no training and minimal materials outperformed trained Reading Recovery teachers.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Center, Y., Wheldall, K., Freeman, L., Outhred, L., & McNaught, M. (1995). An experimental evaluation of Reading Recovery, *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(2), 240-263.

Curry, J., Griffith, J., & Williams, H. (1995). *Reading Recovery in AISD*. Publication No. 94.06. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District Department of Performance Audit and Evaluation.

Donley, J., Baenen, N., & Hundley, S. (1993, April). *A study of the long-term effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Atlanta, GA.

Dyer, P. (1992). Reading Recovery: A cost-effectiveness and educational-outcomes analysis. *ERS Spectrum, 10*, 10-19.

Fincher, G. E. (1991). *Reading Recovery and Chapter I: A three-year comparative study*. Canton, OH: Canton City Schools.

Gregory, D., Earl, L., & O'Donoghue, M. (1994). *A study of Reading Recovery in Scarborough, 1990-1992: Annual site report of the Scarborough School District*. Scarborough, Ontario: Scarborough School District.

Grossen, B., Coulter, G., & Ruggles, B. (1996). Reading Recovery: An evaluation of benefits and costs. *Effective School Practices, 15*(3), 6-24.

Herman, B., & Stringfield. S. (1997). *Ten promising programs for educating all children: Evidence of impact*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Hiebert, E. H. (1994). Reading Recovery in the United States: What difference does it make to an age cohort? *Educational Researcher, 23*(9), 15-25.

Leitner, D. (1990, December). *Portland Reading Recovery program 1989-90 evaluation report: Year 1*. Portland, OR: Portland Public Schools Research and Evaluation Department.

73

National Diffusion Network. (1993). *1992-93 discontinuation data*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery National Data Evaluation Center.

Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Reading Recovery: A review of research*. Columbus, OH: Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center.

Pinnell, G. S. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. *Elementary School Journal, 90*, 161-184.

Pinnell, G. S., DeFord D. E., & Lyons, C.A. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Early interventions for at-risk first graders*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Pinnell, G. S., Lyons, C. A., DeFord, D. E., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*, 8-39.

Reading Recovery National Data Evaluation Center. (1997). *U.S. Reading Recovery children served, program children and percentage of children discontinued from 1984-1996, Table 2*. Columbus, OH: Author.

Shanahan, T., & Barr, R. (1995). Reading Recovery: An independent evaluation of the effects of an early instructional intervention for at-risk learners. *Reading Research Quarterly, 50*(4), 958-996.

Smith-Burke, T., Jaggar, A. M., & Ashdown, J. (1993). *New York University Reading Recovery project: 1992 follow-up study of second graders*. New York: New York University.

Stringfield, S., Herman, R., Brigham, N., Nesselrodt, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Levin, M., & Stevens, R., with Gamse, B., Puma, M., Rosenblum, S., Beaumont, J., Randall, B., & Smith, L. (1997). *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children*. (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Swartz, S. L. (1992). *Cost comparison of selected intervention programs in California*. San Bernardino, CA: California State University.

Swartz, S. L., & Klein, A.F. (1994). Reading Recovery: An overview. *Literacy, Teaching, and Learning, 1*(1), 3-7.

Swartz, S. L., Shook, R. E., & Hoffman, B. M. (1993). *Reading Recovery in California. 1992-93 site report*. San Bernardino, CA: California State University.

Wake County Public School System. (1995, April). *Reading Recovery 1990-94. Evaluation Report*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, CA.

School Development Program

53 College Street
New Haven, CT 06510

Phone: 203-785-2548
Fax: 203-785-3359
Web: http://info.med.yale.edu/comer/

75

School Development Program

Program Overview

The School Development Program (SDP) is a comprehensive initiative that unites the resources of the school, family, and community to promote holistic child development (Comer, 1996). The program, initiated in the late 1960s, is based on the ideas of its founder, James Comer of Yale University, who believes that developing and sustaining positive relationships between students and adults (parents, staff, and teachers) are crucial to creating schools where children are valued and motivated to learn. Consequently, the School Development Program creates new structures such as teams of students, parents, teachers, and other professionals in order to foster these crucial relationships. Broad-based parent participation such as report card conferences, fund-raising, potluck suppers, and involvement in day-to-day school affairs and school governance are key to the School Development Program. SDP also attends to curriculum by integrating basic skills instruction with social skill development. The program is based on research from several academic fields, including population studies, community action, and psychology, and focuses on six aspects of children's development: physical, psychological, social, cognitive, language, and ethical. SDP is designed to serve students in many school and home situations, especially students at risk of school failure.

Program Components

The structural component of the School Development Program is comprised of several school-based teams: the Parent Team, the School Planning and Management Team, and the Student and Staff Support Team, which includes a Mental Health Team. These teams bring together regular classroom teachers, administrators, parents, students, school psychologists, counselors, social workers, special education teachers, and school health staff. These groups work together to create and develop a comprehensive school plan.

During the reform process, time and energy are also focused on the site-based staff development component and identifying the evolving needs of students and staff. The school plan is assessed and modified based on the issues and concerns generated in the staff development work.

Without providing specific lessons, the curriculum and instruction component offers a framework for developing basic academic and social skills instruction. Teachers, with the help of consultants and curriculum specialists, are expected to analyze student data to determine the specific needs of their students. Teachers then develop classroom activities that are expected to meet those needs. The social skills units written by teachers include activities to help students develop social amenities, secure employment, and deal with mainstream society, along with other relevant topics.

The School Development Program employs a parent participation component requiring different levels of commitment, from broad-based activities involving a large number of parents to sophisticated activities involving a few parents in school governance. Typically, these schools offer a range of parent education activities focusing on parenting skills and teaching methods. Parent involvement activities vary from school to school, responding to the unique needs of each school and community.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
Students with special needs/mild-to-moderate disabilities
Urban students

GRADE LEVELS

The School Development Program is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-8.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning

Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
* Adaptive instructional strategies

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Attend to foundation of basic skills
Learning processes
Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
* Use of individual learning plans

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
Kindergarten
Prevention oriented
* Positive schoolwide climate
Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-specific improvement plan
Site-based governance
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

New schools or districts adopting the School Development Program should establish a positive climate prior to the actual intervention. This can take many forms, such as establishing a mixed-stakeholder team to study and understand the School Development Program process and help plan for long-term sustainability and provision of resources. The SDP entry process lasts approximately one year, with the school selecting an external change agent and creating three support teams (Parent

Team, School Planning and Management Team, Student and Staff Support Team) whose members attend a national training program. The teams meet on a regular basis to discuss staff development; school climate; social climate; and resource availability, utilization, and coordination. Workshops are designed and developed for teachers and parents and held as needed. Information about the program is disseminated to all stakeholders through forums, articles, and informational conferences. The program and its effects are enhanced by district-level involvement and an active school partnership with key central office staff.

The program developers envision a 5-year implementation cycle comprised of 5 phases and 20 critical activities:

Phase One: Planning and Pre-orientation (several months -1 year)

- Establish central office agreements and commitments.
- Form a steering committee at the district level.
- Describe and discuss the nine SDP elements.
- Select and orient facilitator and/or district liaison.

Phase Two: Orientation (year 1-2)

- Collect baseline data.
- Train facilitators, school staff, and parents.
- Establish and train three teams (Parent Team, School Planning and Management Team, and Student and Staff Support Team).
- Orient key district personnel.
- Process documentation.
- Form Principals' Academy.

Phase Three: Transition (year 2-3)

- Adopt guiding principles: "no fault" decision making, consensus decision making, collaboration
- Adopt mechanisms for development: parent involvement program, school planning management team, mental health team
- Adopt operations: comprehensive school plan, staff development, assessment, and modification.
- Continue process documentation.
- Follow-up consultation about implementation process.

Phase Four: (year 3-4)

- Increase self-sufficiency with SDP implementation.
- Continue process documentation.
- Assess outcomes.

Phase Five: (year 4-5)

- Integrate SDP into total operations of the school.
- Expand local training and dissemination of information.
- Assess summative outcomes.
- Monitor process and outcomes periodically.

Studies of the implementation process reveal that the principal's attitude and leadership and the level of teacher support greatly affect implementation. Teachers' knowledge of child development research and theory, strong interpersonal and teamwork skills, parent involvement, regular and frequent team meetings, and the establishment of clear goals by each of the teams also contribute to successful implementation. Obstacles to implementation included unclear expectations and procedures, staff resistance to change, and teachers' resistance to parent involvement.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Improved student self-concept
- More positive student attitudes towards school
- Better student behavior in school (e.g., increased engagement, resolution of conflicts)
- Increased student academic achievement and school success (e.g., completion of assignments, regular school attendance, better grades)
- Improved school climate for learning
- Greater parent involvement in their children's learning
- Improved ability of schools to meet children's nonacademic needs (e.g., medical, social)

PROGRAM EFFECTS

A review of the effects of the School Development Program reveals some positive impacts on student achievement and school climate. Two of the five studies show improvements in students' reading and standardized test scores (Comer, Haynes, Hamilton-Lee, Boger & Pollack, 1986; Haynes, Comer, Hamilton-Lee, Boger, & Joyner, 1987); one notes improved math achievement test scores (Comer et al., 1986). Other positive impacts noted include improvements in students' self-concept, classroom behavior, and group participation (Haynes et al., 1987). Improvements in the overall school climate, as measured by attendance and suspension rates and the frequency of serious punishments, were also found (Ascher, 1993; Haynes et al., 1987).

Stringfield et al. (1994), McCollum (1994), and Ascher (1993) provide overviews of several different reform programs. All three of these authors found a limited scope of data regarding the effectiveness of the SDP on student learning outcomes. Stringfield draws upon a summarized report from the Child Study Center, which found "significant positive effects of the SDP on measured outcomes" (p. 16). The

measures include student achievement, behavior, attendance, self-concept, and assessment of school climate by students, parents, and teachers. However, Stringfield et al. provide no further information regarding the report's conclusions. McCollum found the effects of SDP on student academic progress to be "indirect." Also citing a study from the Child Study Center, McCollum reports increased attendance, improved academic achievement, and a reduction in discipline problems. "However, following the program's districtwide expansion, these schools' improvement record has tapered off" (p. 35). Stringfield et al. and McCollum seem to be discussing the same study, but the documentation is unclear.

Ascher (1993) concludes that SDP schools also have an effect on school climate by increasing attendance, reducing suspensions and classroom behavior problems, and promoting more positive attitudes toward authority. A general finding of SDP schools is that students tend to have better self-concepts than students in non-SDP schools (Haynes & Comer, 1990; Haynes & Emmons, 1990a, b, c; Joyner, 1990).

Several evaluations of the School Development Program were conducted in the late 1980s. Among these was an evaluation of the SDP schools in Benton Harbor, Michigan (Comer et al., 1986). Scores on the California Achievement Test (CAT) reading, mathematics, and total battery and the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) were analyzed, as were climate indicators (suspensions, attendance, and corporal punishment). Schools in the Benton Harbor study included four from the original implementation phase in 1982-83 and three schools included in 1984-85. No control schools were included in the research design. Low-achieving schools with the highest rates of suspensions, absenteeism, and corporal punishment were chosen for participation. The CAT results by grade level for all seven of these SDP schools demonstrated that "in Reading, the average gain for SDP schools equaled that of the district as a whole at the second-grade level and exceeded the district gains at the fifth- and sixth-grade levels. In Mathematics, the average gain for program schools exceeded that for the district at the second- and fourth-grade levels" (p. 36). Seventy-five percent of MEAP objectives in mathematics were achieved by at least 45% of students in SDP schools in 1982 (the baseline year) and 78% in 1985; in reading, 37% of students mastered 75% of MEAP reading objectives in 1982, and 49% in 1985.

The impact of SDP on school climate was measured in terms of suspensions, absenteeism, and corporal punishment. The data revealed that the number of suspension days for SDP schools declined steadily. In 1983-84, there was an 8% decrease, and in 1984-85 the total decrease was 19%, compared to a district-wide increase of 34% in suspension days. Between 1982 and 1983, the days absent in SDP schools declined by 18%. Neither SDP schools nor schools district-wide, reported any change in absenteeism between 1983-84 and 1984-85. One striking finding reveals that corporal punishment declined in SDP schools by 80% in 1983-84 and 100% in 1984-85. This compares to a reduction in corporal punishment from 69% to 34% in the district as a whole. The Benton Harbor results indicate that

81

SDP schools, when compared to schools district-wide, revealed improvements in school achievement and climate. The import of these findings, however, is limited by the lack of significance testing of results and, in some instances, the lack of data from comparison groups. Although positive trends in school achievement and school climate are apparent, a more rigorous analysis of results is necessary to determine whether these changes are significantly different from those occurring in similar district schools.

Haynes et al. (1987) conducted research in the Benton Harbor Area Schools during 1985 and 1986 to examine the sustained impact of SDP. The study included 313 students in grades K-5. Significant differences ($p < .05$) between the pre- and posttest scores were found in classroom climate dimensions and three of the six self-concept dimensions (behavior; school and intellectual status; and happiness and satisfaction). The teacher questionnaires revealed significant improvements in classroom behavior and group participation. With respect to the perception of school climate, parents assessed their child's school climate as "significantly improved," yet teachers did not show any significant change in their assessments of their own school's climate. Children showed no significant change in their assessment of their own behavior, yet parents showed significant positive change in their assessments of their child's behavior (children in the control groups showed a significant negative change in their assessment of their own behaviors). There was a significant decrease in the percentage of days absent, and children showed a significant improvement in reading grades, but no significant change in math grades. On the California Achievement Test (CAT), children showed significant gains in grade equivalent units in reading, language, math, and the total battery.

Haynes, Maholmes, Emmons, and Gebreyesus (1994) compared students at two SDP middle schools and two non-SDP middle schools ($n = 172$) in a northeastern city. SDP students showed higher mean scores on the psychosocial variables than non-SDP students. Regarding achievement, the authors analyzed data only for students in grades 5 and 6 ($n = 88$). In language achievement, fifth grade SDP students had higher mean CAT scores than sixth grade SDP students, while the reverse was true at non-SDP schools. In reading and mathematics, SDP sixth graders had higher mean CAT scores than SDP fifth graders. The same was true for non-SDP students.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Ascher, C. (1993). Changing schools for urban students: The School Development Program, Accelerated Schools, and Success for All. *Trends and Issues, 18*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Comer, J. (1996). *Rallying the whole village: The Comer process for reforming education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N., Hamilton-Lee, M., Boger, J., & Pollack, D. (1986, August). *Academic and affective gains from the School Development Program: A model for school development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Haynes, N. M., & Comer, J. P. (1990). Effects of a School Development Program on self-concept. *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine, 63*, 275-284.

Haynes, N. M. & Emmons, C. L. (1990a). *School climate report: Clemente Middle School*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Child Study Center.

Haynes, N. M., & Emmons, C. L. (1990b). *School climate report: Fair Haven Middle School*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Child Study Center.

Haynes, N. M., & Emmons, C. L. (1990c). *School climate report: Jackie Robinson Middle School*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Child Study Center.

Haynes, N. M., Maholmes, V., Emmons, C., & Gebreysus, S. (1994). An examination of the psychosocial and school achievement characteristics among SDP and non-SDP middle school students. In N. M. Haynes (Ed.), *School Development Program research monograph*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Child Study Center.

Haynes, N. M., Comer, J., Hamilton-Lee, M., Boger, J., & Joyner, E. T. (1987). *School Development Program impact study Benton Harbor 1985-1986*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Child Study Center.

Joyner, E. T. (1990). *The Comer model: School improvement for students at-risk*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT.

McCollum, H. (1994). *School reform for youth at risk: Analysis of six change models*. (Contract No. LC. #89089001). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M., Puma, M., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: First-year report* (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Success for All

The Johns Hopkins University
Center for the Social Organization of Schools
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218-3888

Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-516-0543
Web: www.successforall.com

Success for All

Program Overview

Success for All (SFA) stresses reading and language arts and helps schools and classrooms in preventing academic deficiencies and in intervening, as needed, to overcome problems. This program is based on the premise that all students can and should succeed (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996). SFA, initiated in 1987 by Robert E. Slavin, Director of the Center for Research on the Education for Students Placed at Risk, is built on the idea that all children can and must succeed in the early grades. The program draws on two principles: prevention and immediate, intensive intervention. Prevention of academic problems requires providing children with the best available classroom programs and engaging parents in support of their children's school success. Success for All prevents later academic problems with preschool and kindergarten programs that prepare young children for later schooling as well as with its intervention programs, especially tutoring. Other intervention activities include 8-week assessments of student learning, cooperative learning, family involvement, and staff development and support. Many of the students served are economically disadvantaged, attend Title I schools, and are nonnative English-speakers. Materials are available in both English and Spanish.

The curricular emphasis of Success for All is on developing reading and writing skills. Math, science, and social studies materials are also available, although they have not been as widely used by schools. During reading instruction, children from all the school's SFA classrooms are placed into groups of about 15 students reading at the same level regardless of age or grade, for 90-minute periods. In grades K-3, specially trained tutors work with students who are falling behind their classmates in reading. SFA provides its own curriculum to accompany commercially available books and basal reading series; SFA does not provide its own reading books or basal readers.

In grades K-1, teachers read to students and discuss stories to enhance students' listening and speaking vocabulary and their understanding of story structure. Using phonetically regular story books, teachers develop students' phonetic awareness, auditory discrimination, and sound blending. They also develop students' ability to make meaning, understand context, and use metacognitive strategies. In grades 2-5, students use Success for All materials in conjunction with the school's regular reading materials for reading, discussion, and writing. The program stresses direct instruction and cooperative learning activities to develop students' reading skills.

Program Components

One of the best known components of Success for All is its curricular component focused on reading and early literacy. This component includes specially designed curriculum based on effective practices in early reading to be used with commercially available reading books and basal reading texts. A tutoring component supports the

reading instruction program in grades 1-3. First-grade students receive priority for tutoring. An 8-week assessment component is designed to determine whether students are making satisfactory progress in reading. Information from the assessment is used to place students in appropriate reading groups and to determine whether tutoring is necessary.

A half-day preschool promotes the language development, school readiness, and positive self-concept of 4-year-olds. A full-day kindergarten continues the emphasis on language development by introducing children's literature and language experiences to develop students' oral skills and print and math concepts.

The program support component includes a family support team, a site-based program facilitator, and a kindergarten and preschool provider who is present at most SFA schools. Support also includes an advisory committee comprised of a principal, facilitator, teacher, parent representatives, and family support staff. The advisory committee meets regularly to review the program's progress and address any problems that arise.

Teacher training includes 3 inservice days at the beginning of the school year and continued follow-up training throughout the year. For teachers in grades 1-3 and for reading tutors, training focuses on the implementation of the reading program, general teaching strategies, and use of specific lessons. Tutors also receive an additional day of training in reading assessment. For preschool and kindergarten teachers, training emphasizes the use of language experience activities. Follow-up inservice training by SFA facilitators and other staff includes topics such as classroom management, cooperative learning, and instructional pace. Facilitators also arrange meetings for teachers to reflect on individual concerns and students.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Increase family involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
Students with special needs/mild-moderate disabilities
Young readers with reading difficulties
ESL or bilingual students
Urban students

GRADE LEVELS

Success for All is a curricular reform program implemented in grades Pre-K-6.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

This list of key practices was compiled from the program descriptions prepared by the program developer. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring teacher/aide and student
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Homogeneous grouping

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Tailored to student cultural background
  Challenging academic content
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
  Kindergarten
  Prevention oriented

Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Small class size
Coordinated school-linked services
* Inclusive school
Pullout for instruction

IMPLEMENTATION

To adopt Success for All, a school's staff must have voted at least 80% in favor of participating in the program, and districts must make a clear commitment to implement the program. In a Success for All school, all teachers and tutors must be certified. The staff development model calls for relatively short initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion. Detailed manuals and 3 days of inservice training are provided at the beginning of the year, and informal sessions throughout the school year allow teachers to brainstorm and discuss individual children. Training for the classroom teachers and the reading tutors of the first three grades focuses on the implementation of the reading program, including teaching strategies and specific lessons. There are up to six reading tutors who work individually with the students. Preschool and kindergarten teachers and aides receive training in the use of STaR (Story Telling and Retelling), the Peabody language development kits, and thematic units. Tutors receive an additional two days of training on tutoring strategies and reading assessments. The program also recommends having a full-time facilitator for implementation and ongoing support to the teachers.

The program usually offers a half-day preschool and a full-day kindergarten. A range of support services is provided by the SFA program. For example, health services are provided for students once a week. A Family Support Team, consisting of staff, parent liaisons, and counselors, educates and offers assistance to families in an area related to school preparedness such as attendance, health, and nutrition (Education Commission of the States, 1991). The Family Support Team also works to create strong relations with the parents and encourage their involvement with the school. Programs available to parents may address issues such as parenting skills and raising readers.

The program utilizes heterogeneous age-grouped classes, but students in the first 3 grades, and sometimes grades 4-6, are regrouped for reading by reading performance level. These classes are smaller than homerooms and may have first, second, and third graders who read at the same level in one classroom.

The program developers have identified several conditions that must be in place to ensure effective implementation. Slavin and his associates believe that there must be a process of informed buy-in, during which school staff learn about the program and vote to adopt it. Finances and local curriculum requirements must be addressed prior to implementation. The four SFA conditions for implementation are:

- School staff must make an informed choice to adopt Success for All.
- District administrators must clearly support the program.
- The main program must be implemented.
- Districts must work out a way to adequately staff the program, providing funding for training, materials and other expenses.

The program also calls for a "relentless focus" on the success of every child (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996).

In *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children*, Stringfield et al. (1997) examined six SFA sites and found that Success for All's systematic nature is critical to its successful implementation. Its key elements—regrouping, assessment, individualization, and remediation—speak to the structure of the program rather than to the personalities in charge. SFA's systemic nature notwithstanding, communication among staff members was found to have a profound impact on the quality of the implementation, as did district support and a cohesive teaching staff. The use of teacher aides as tutors did not have a negative impact on the program. Training provided by the program developer tended to allow for more consistent program implementation. Researchers found that schools can encourage parental involvement by incorporating existing programs for parents and maintaining sensitivity to diverse cultural issues. Researchers determined that the prescribed materials are not essential in all phases of SFA, but alternative materials must coincide with the program's strategy and content. Also, piecemeal curricular adjustments by the teachers eroded the program's coherency.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Grade-level proficiency in basic skills by every student by third grade

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Success for All posits that, regardless of family background, every child should have an opportunity to succeed in school. Based on results of their replication study, the program developers believe they have removed one more excuse for schools not being able to educate low-achieving, disadvantaged children. Several key evaluations of SFA have been conducted by program developers. They indicate improved student reading achievement and reduced absenteeism, grade retention, and special education placements (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1991; Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1992; Slavin & Madden, 1994; Slavin, Karweit, & Wasik, 1994; Slavin et al., 1993; Slavin & Madden, 1995). SFA developers conclude that success for disadvantaged students can be "routinely ensured in schools that are not exceptional or extraordinary (and were not producing great success before the program was introduced)" (Slavin et al., 1993, p. 20). Program developers, in line with their claims that their program works with all students, have conducted several studies of SFA's effectiveness with non-White students. One study focused on Asian students (Slavin & Yampolsky, 1991), and

another study on Spanish-speaking students (Slavin & Madden, 1995). Both found the program to confer benefits for both populations, including interests and skills of the students and larger community.

The majority of external studies report mixed effects for SFA students (Dianda & Flaherty, 1995; Jones, Gottfredson, & Gottfredson, 1997; Ross & Smith, 1994; Stringfield et al., 1994; Venezky, 1994). Ross and Smith (1994) conducted a third-party evaluation of a single school to determine the first-year influence of the SFA program on reading achievement in grades K-2. Kindergarten children's results revealed significant advantages for SFA participation on two of three reading tests (word identification and word attack). There were no program effects on standardized achievement scores for the overall or low-achieving samples in the two grades.

Jones et al. (1997) reveal mixed results for students at one SFA school compared to students at a comparison school in Charleston, SC. They found positive effects for other early elementary grades.

Venezky (1995), in a third-party evaluation of SFA in five Baltimore City Public Schools, found that the average SFA student reads 2.4 years behind the national norms for comparably aged students. Venezky concludes that only 12.5% of SFA students are at or near grade level after 5 years of participation in the program. A further analysis of the Woodcock Passage Comprehension subtest revealed that SFA students were reading almost at grade level by the end of grade 1 but fell behind with each additional year. In grades 4 and 5, SFA students only made about 0.6 years of progress. Comparisons of SFA with the national norms for the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) produced identical results. These results cannot be attributed to more able SFA students leaving the program. Statistical analyses of SFA survivors versus leavers indicated no significant difference between test scores for those who stayed in SFA as opposed to those who left. A final analysis was conducted to determine the cumulative effects of SFA. An analysis of covariance using CTBS total reading scores as the dependent measure and "end of kindergarten" as a covariate showed no significant differences between participating for 5 or 6 years in SFA and any amount of participation between 1 and 6 years. Based on Venezky's findings, no further advantage is derived from SFA participation after first grade.

A third-party evaluation of SFA's effectiveness with English language learners was conducted by Dianda and Flaherty (1995) of SFA in three California schools with large bilingual programs. The SFA bilingual students scored at grade level but were 6 months above controls. The SFA Spanish students in sheltered English programs were about 2 months below grade level, but still 4 months ahead of control students. In addition, Dianda and Flaherty's study reveals that SFA can reduce the need for special education services by increasing the reading achievement of low achievers, which, in turn, reduces special education referrals and placements. The analyses of the performance of the lowest 25% of SFA classes focus directly on this concern.

While the effect sizes for students average in general around +.50, the effect sizes for lowest achievers average between +1.00 and +1.50. These large effect sizes indicate that SFA can substantially improve the performance of low achievers.

In *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children*, Stringfield et al. (1997) report findings from the first year of their longitudinal study examining cross-program outcomes. SFA students were about as engaged in academics as students in other programs, more engaged in interactive instruction with teachers, and about as socially engaged or uninvolved as students in other programs. SFA students also showed about average rates of interaction with teachers, less interaction with aides, and almost 20% greater interaction among peers.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Dianda, M. R., & Flaherty, J. F. (1995, April). *Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Education Commission of the States. (1991). *Restructuring the educational system: A consumer's guide. Vol. 1*. Denver, CO: Author.

Jones, E. M., Gottfredson, G. D. & Gottfredson, D.C. (1997). *Success for some: An evaluation of a Success for All program. Technical Report*. Ellicott City, MD: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.

Madden, N., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (199?). *Success for All: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide element as a restructuring program*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). Effects of the Success for All model on kindergarten through second grade reading achievement, teachers' adjustments and classroom-school climate at an inner-city schools. *Elementary School Journal, 95*(2), 121-138.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Wasik, B. A. (1994). *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (April, 1995). *Effects of Success for All on the achievement of English language learners*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1994). *Lee Comingo: Effects of Success for All in bilingual first graders*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). *Every child, every school: Success for All*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., Wasik, B. A, Ross, S., & Smith, L. (1993). *Whenever and wherever we choose...the replication of Success for All*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1992). *Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Success for All: Effects on students with limited English proficiency: A three-year evaluation*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M., Puma, M., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: First-year report* (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Stringfield, S., Herman, R., Brigham, N., Nesselrodt, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Levin, M., & Stevens, R., with Gamse, B., Puma, M., Rosenblum, S., Beaumont, J., Randall, B., & Smith, L. (1997). *Special strategies for educating disadvantaged children*. (Contract #LC90010001 and Contract #LC90010002). Washington, DC: Office of the Undersecretary, U.S. Department of Education.

Venezky, R.L. (1994). *An evaluation of Success for All: Final report to the France and Merrick Foundations*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware, Department of Educational Studies.

Other Programs

This section includes brief descriptions of relatively new research-based programs. These emerging programs have not yet been systematically evaluated on a large scale; however, they are an important resource for assisting educators interested in implementing research-based reform in their schools and districts.

THE AMERICA'S CHOICE™ SCHOOL DESIGN

700 11th Street, NW
Suite 750
Washington, DC 20001

Phone: 202-783-3668
Fax: 202-783-3672
Web: www.ncee.org/ourPrograms/narePage.html

THE AMERICA'S CHOICE™ SCHOOL DESIGN

(FORMERLY THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION)

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The America's Choice Comprehensive Design Network (begun in 1989 as the National Alliance for Restructuring Education) is a comprehensive design for K-12 schools determined to get their students to high, internationally benchmarked standards in English, math, and science. It includes a design for quickly identifying students who are falling behind and bringing them back to standard; and maintains a planning and management system for making efficient use of available resources to raise student performance as quickly as possible. The design focuses in the early years on literacy in reading, writing, and mathematics and at the high school level on a demanding academic core intended to prepare all students for college.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The America's Choice School Design is based on researched, proven approaches to prevention, early intervention, and acceleration; it is not based on remediation. In the elementary grades, the curriculum is heavily focused on literacy development, emphasizing phonics, oral language, guided reading and writing, and independent reading and writing. The high school program concentrates on moving students toward demanding academic performance standards and providing a strong technical program to the students who want it. The program provides resources designed to help schools and districts match their curriculum to program standards. Accountability systems for districts include rewards and consequences for schools based on their performance, systems for allocating control over funds to schools, school performance monitoring and review systems, and special assistance for low-performing schools.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Students with special needs/mild-moderate disabilities
Young readers with reading difficulties
ESL or bilingual students
Urban students
Rural students

GRADE LEVELS

America's Choice School Design is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Use of technology
  Student choice of learning activities

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes

Authentic assessments
Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
Kindergarten
Prevention oriented
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision
* Small class size
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-specific improvement plan
Site-based governance
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

Individual schools implement the America's Choice Design over 3 or more years with direct assistance from program staff. Key staff members from the schools attend intensive training sessions to prepare for certification as leaders in America's Choice professional development programs. These individuals then lead professional development sessions with their peers, using program materials to implement the key elements of the design. The program's design team also provides on-site technical assistance to support implementation of the school design.

Districts that choose to embark on comprehensive district reform in conjunction with school-level design implementation meet with America's Choice consultants over 3 years to set up a central-office management system based on new accountability principles. These principles shift the incentives operating on all individuals involved in the program in ways that reward results in improved student achievement. A central data office is established to compile such measures as student performance against standards, dropout rates, retention rates, and "customer satisfaction" as measured by periodic surveys of the satisfaction rates of parents, teachers, staff, and members of the community. Organizational charts are redrawn, and decision-making authority is dispersed. A system is developed of clearly defined rewards for improved student achievement and consequences for the absence of

progress. For underperforming schools, a system of probation and intervention is established to help move them up to standards.

Each year the school staff participates in a session focused on analyzing the results of their work and planning for the next steps in implementation. During site visits, program staff help the principal and leadership team monitor implementation and strengthen design elements.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Benchmarked standards in English language arts, math, and science
- Certificate of Initial Mastery

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Early results in schools in Kentucky and Chicago showed significant improvements in scores on standardized tests. Of the 15 original program schools in Kentucky, 13 (87%) earned cash rewards in 1995, the first year of that state's incentive program, compared with 38% of schools statewide. From 1992 to 1996, an average of 74% of Kentucky program schools met or exceeded their performance goals. Kennedy Elementary School in Louisville showed a 25% increase in recent Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) scores across all grades.

Out of 13 program schools in Chicago, about 80% showed notable increases in their scores on citywide tests. These schools also showed a notable increase in fourth-, eighth- and tenth-grade student performance on the New Standards Reference Examinations in English language arts and mathematics. Twenty-three to 49% of students taking the examinations moved from the lowest category (little evidence of achievement) to the second or third of a 5-category scoring rubric.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce (1990). *America's Choice: High skills or low wages!* Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Marshall, R., & Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a living: Education and the wealth of nations*. New York: Basic Books.

New Standards (1997). *Performance Standards: Vols. 1-3* (Elementary, Middle, and High School). Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy; Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

Tucker, M. S., & Codding, J. B. (1998). *Standards for our schools: How to set them, measure them, and reach them.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tucker, M. (1994). *Designing the new American high school.* Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy.

ATLAS COMMUNITIES

ATLAS Communities Education
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158-1060

Phone: 617-969-7100
Fax: 617-969-3440
Web: www.edc.org/FSC/ATLAS/

ATLAS Communities

Program Overview

ATLAS Communities was conceived as a partnership of four respected educational reform programs—the Coalition of Essential Schools at Brown University, the School Development Program at Yale, Project Zero at Harvard, and the Educational Development Center in Boston—bringing together 100 years of experience in school reform. The ATLAS Communities design focuses on the development of pathways—groups of schools made up of high schools and the elementary and middle schools that feed into them. Thus, a pathway for personalized learning is created for all students from pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to align curriculum and assessments to district and state standards. The teachers in each pathway collaborate with parents and administrators to implement management and academic policies that support the success of all students. There are 57 ATLAS schools in 12 pathways, representing 9 districts in 7 states—Florida, Maryland, Maine, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Washington. ATLAS plans to add pathways in other regions throughout the U.S.

Program Components

For the last 5 years, ATLAS Communities has been working with pathways of schools in districts across the country to:

- Improve learning outcomes for all students
- Evaluate student work through a variety of standard and innovative assessment tools
- Engage teachers in serious and sustained professional development
- Involve families and other members of the community in the education of their children
- Reorganize the internal structures and decision-making processes within schools and districts to support all of the above

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
Students with special needs/mild-moderate disabilities
Young readers with reading difficulties
ESL or bilingual students
Urban students
Rural students

GRADE LEVELS

Atlas Communities is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades Pre-K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Use of technology

Student choice of learning activities
Multiple intelligences
Homogeneous grouping

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Attend to foundation of basic skills
Learning processes
Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
Challenging academic content
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments
Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
Kindergarten
Prevention oriented
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision
* Small class size
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-specific improvement plan
Site-based governance
* Inclusive school
Pullout for instruction
Encourage action research

IMPLEMENTATION

ATLAS has the capacity to add up to 15 new pathways each year. The process for becoming an ATLAS community includes:

- An awareness presentation by an ATLAS representative
- Identification of at least one K-12 pathway with a minimum of 3 schools (1 elementary school, 1 middle school, and 1 high school). School staff decide on the level of support needed to proceed with the implementation of the ATLAS design; ATLAS does not specify the percentage who must approve.
- Commitment to a multi-year implementation process
- Commitment to implementing the 5 key elements of the ATLAS Communities framework
- Participation in an initial pathway engagement process, either as a separate activity or as part of the first year of implementation
- Identification of a pathway coordinator supported by the district
- Ongoing district support for staff development

Most ATLAS pathways engage in a 3-5 year implementation process. The process begins with an on-site 3-5 day institute for teams of staff from each school in the pathway. The ATLAS Site Developer works with the staff in each pathway school to develop annual action plans. Progress and satisfaction are assessed regularly against implementation benchmarks. Other on-site core activities include the following:

- Biweekly or monthly meetings for school and pathway leadership teams
- Weekly meetings of whole faculty study groups in all pathways
- Site-specific workshops and presentations integrating key components of the ATLAS framework
- Spring pathway review/reflection/celebration

An ATLAS Communities Site Developer provides customized technical assistance both on- and off-site. The Site Developer serves as a critical friend, builds capacity by working closely with school and district staff, helps identify assets and needs, organizes professional development activities, brokers additional resources as needed, and ensures that the ATLAS framework is in full operation. The ATLAS Communities Study Group Specialist works intensively with each pathway during an initial institute to launch faculty study groups. Thereafter, the Specialist holds on-site meetings with these groups on a regular basis; communication is maintained via telephone, written correspondence, and the Internet. The ATLAS Web Facilitator collaborates with sites to expand the use of the Web as a tool to advance the scale-up of the ATLAS model. All technical assistance is tailored to local needs. Networking is supported through the annual Principals' Institute; regional and cross-site institutes; and cross-site visits.

Expected Program Outcomes

- Improvements in school culture
- Significant changes in instructional methods
- Improved student habits
- Performance-based assessments
- Standardized test scores

Program Effects

Within 3-5 years of implementation, student outcomes in ATLAS sites have shown improvement across a number of measures. The environment in which teaching and learning occur changes dramatically, and parents and community members become deeply engaged in the life of schools. In addition, ATLAS builds local ownership and leadership capacity, showing promise that districts can sustain change over time.

Standardized test scores have increased in all pathways that have worked with the ATLAS framework for 3 years or more. According to school district reports, in Prince George's County, MD, reading scores jumped 13% in two years. In Norfolk, VA, a 15% increase occurred in achievement tests for research, writing, and science—all areas directly related to the eleventh grade exhibition tasks. Norfolk scores also improved in middle school reading, writing, and mathematics. In Memphis, TN, scores on ninth-grade state assessments for reading and math improved for the fourth consecutive year. Performance-based assessments also show strong gains. In Gorhan, ME, fourth-grade scores on the state assessment were the highest in the district's history.

Reports from the Norfolk, VA school district indicate that teachers and students think of the elementary, middle, and high school as "one school with three campuses." Principals meet regularly to discuss common concerns and plan jointly for the work in their individual schools. The high school revised course requirements in order to eliminate redundancy, create longer class periods, and focus on inquiry models of learning. Disciplinary incidents declined 15% at the middle school. The dropout rate across the system has decreased, and attendance has increased.

Related Publications

ATLAS Communities. (1998). *Charting the Course*. Newton, MA: Author.

Orrell, C. J. (1996). ATLAS Communities: Authentic teaching, learning, and assessment. In S. Stringfield, S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: New American Schools Designs* (pp. 53-74). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rosenblum and Brigham Associates. (1998). *Assessing the Impact*. Weymouth, MA: Author.

CO-NECT SCHOOLS

70 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617-873-5612
Fax: 617-873-2589
Web: www.co-nect.com/

Co-NECT Schools

Program Overview

Co-NECT is a national school assistance organization focused on results. Through a combination of on-site and online professional development, Co-NECT gives K-12 educators the tools, skills, and support to successfully implement comprehensive school reform. The goals of the program are to boost academic achievement for all students in core subject areas, connect academic knowledge with the real world, promote community accountability and involvement, and make every school an exciting, rewarding place in which to teach and learn. Technology is used as a common thread to bring teachers, students, administrators, and others together in pursuit of these goals.

Program Components

Co-NECT's design is based on a set of five benchmarks derived from best practices in some of the most effective schools in the United States as well as from the program's practical experience working with schools since 1993. These benchmarks include:

- High expectations for all students and community accountability for results
- Schoolwide emphasis on practical application of academic knowledge to authentic problems, including projects that build on two-way relationships with parents and the surrounding community
- Use of multiple forms of assessments that measure actual student and school performance and promote community accountability
- Organization of the school into small learning communities designed to strengthen relationships among students, teachers, and families for sustained periods
- Sensible use of the best available technology for everyone

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

Students Served

All students

Grade Levels

Co-NECT is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-12.

Program Practices

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

Classroom Practices

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Use of technology
  Student choice of learning activities
  Multiple intelligences
  Homogeneous grouping

Curriculum Assessment

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
  Challenging academic content

* Frequent assessments
  Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  School restructuring
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Flexible scheduling
  Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
  Site-specific improvement plan
  Site-based governance
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

Co-NECT offers an integrated package of products and services for planning and professional development. These include:

- A flexible benchmarking system aimed at helping school leaders integrate separate "programs" and initiatives into a single whole-school change process
- Workshops, onsite consultation, and distance learning on critical topics such as project-based learning, assessment, and technology integration
- Personal attention from a site director assigned to the school
- Access to the Co-NECT Exchange, a collection of Internet-based curriculum resources and software tools for teachers and administrators
- Participation in national programs including Co-NECT Critical Friends and an annual technology conference

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Gains in student achievement in core subject areas (reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies) as measured by local standardized tests
- Gains in all students' ability to apply deep content understanding and practical skills (such as skills in technology, teamwork, and communication) to practical problems of interest to students and others—as evidenced by project work, demonstrations, and exhibitions
- Successful comprehensive school reform—as evidenced by evaluations of teaching, assessment, school organization, and technology use, based on "best practice" benchmarks

- Increased capacity to produce continuing improvements in student achievement and preparation over the long run—as evidenced by a sustained track record of student achievement

PROGRAM EFFECTS

While most Co-NECT schools are in the early stages of implementation, almost all are beginning to see significant progress in key areas, including test scores, student engagement, parent and community involvement, and, for teachers, a sense of membership in a dynamic professional community. Some of the highlights are noted below:

- Since becoming a Co-NECT school in 1992, the ALL School in Worcester, MA has seen steady increases in all subject areas on state tests, including gains as high as 23% from 1994-96.
- All 4 Co-NECT elementary schools in Cincinnati, OH posted overall gains in the percentage of students scoring "proficient" or higher on the Ohio State Proficiency Test in 1997. The average gain for 3 of the 4 schools was above the district average.
- All 6 original Co-NECT elementary schools in Memphis, TN showed strong 2-year gains on the state writing assessment given every year to fourth graders. The percentage of students with "proficient" scores at Double Tree Elementary School rose from 5% in 1995 (the year before the school began to work with Co-NECT) to 47% in 1997. Scores at Alton Elementary, a Title I school, rose from 6% proficient to 30% proficient.
- After beginning to work with Co-NECT, Campus Elementary School in Memphis TN posted gains of 5% or more for 2 years in a row in math at grades 4-6. This trend began in 1996 and was sustained in 1997. In 1997, Campus also showed gains in science in grades 3-6.
- Fourth graders at Roosevelt Elementary, a Co-NECT school in Cincinnati, OH, showed improvement on every section of the Ohio State Proficiency Test, which includes sections on reading, writing, math, science, and citizenship. Overall, Roosevelt gained an average of 9.4 points in the percentage of students in both fourth and sixth grade scoring "proficient" or better. This was almost 3 times the average district gain.
- At Campbell Drive Middle School in Dade County, FL the percentage of students scoring "3.0 or higher" on the state writing assessment is now up to 72%.
- Campbell Drive was the only school in its region to show improvement and was the second most improved middle school in Dade County.

Factors that contributed to successful implementation include consistency and commitment of teachers during the implementation process, involvement of leadership in issues of teaching and learning, faculty commitment, and parent/community support (Co-NECT Schools, 1998).

Related Publications

Collins, A., Morrison, D., & Newman, D. (1994). In C. Reigeluth & A. Garfinkle (Eds.), *Systemic change in education*. (pp. 71-82) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Co-NECT Schools. (1998). *Sharing accountability for results*. Cambridge, MA: Author.

Goldberg, B., & Richards, J. (1995, September). Leveraging technology for school reform: Changing schools and communities into learning organizations. *Educational Technology, 35*(5), 5-16.

Direct Instruction

National Institute for Direct Instruction
805 Lincoln Street
Eugene, OR 97401

Phone: 541-485-1973
Fax: 541-683-7543
Web: www.adihome.org/

Direct Instruction

Program Overview

The Direct Instruction model incorporates a specified curriculum for all content areas covering the elementary school grades. Students are assessed and placed on the basis of mastery of this curriculum. Training provides staff with diagnostic and placement skills as well as presentation and reinforcement skills. Implementation and training takes place over a period of several years. The ultimate goal of implementation at a particular site is for the school to achieve self-sufficiency in training, teaching, and maintenance of the program. Schools that implement the program serve as models of what can be uniformly achieved with at-risk populations.

Program Components

District-employed trainers who are experts in implementing Direct Instruction provide technical expertise. A streamlined administrative system assumes accountability for the performance of teachers and students. Local school staffing includes a program facilitator and peer coaches for teachers.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

Students Served

All students

Grade Levels

Direct Instruction is a curricular reform program implemented in grades K-6.

Program Practices

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student
  Homogeneous grouping

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
  Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments
  Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

  School restructuring
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
  Kindergarten
  Prevention oriented
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Shared school vision
  Site-specific improvement plan
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

The National Institute for Direct Instruction provides districts with a training program in methodology for teachers and aides in addition to providing technical assistance. The fundamental purpose of implementation is to significantly improve academic performance over current performance levels.

Implementation requirements for districts include the following:

- The district superintendent recommends the school and commits to full implementation of the program for all students. The agreement is for 5 years.

- The principal agrees to implement daily schedules, instructional programs, grouping and management procedures, and a 2-3 year timetable for implementing all programs and procedures in all grades with all students.
- The teachers consent and commit to following specified daily schedules, grouping students for instruction, attending scheduled preservice and inservice training, receiving in-class monitoring and classroom assistance, and using program-specific instructional materials.

The general goal is to implement all classes, K-6, by the second year of implementation. During the third through fifth year of implementation, students in all subject areas will be accelerated to the greatest degree that is possible.

The first year of implementation involves the teaching of reading and language at all designated grade levels. Reading will be scheduled for two sessions daily during the first year. During the second year, math, spelling, and core social studies and science units will be implemented in all designated grade levels. Introduction of these programs will vary according to the performance level of the students and the ease with which the teacher is implementing other programs. During years 3-5 of program implementation, performance of continuing students will dictate changes in the various programs that are taught at each grade level.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Projected schedules for presenting lessons (teachers)
- Performance level and learning rates of students
- Mastery of all material presented

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Average reading rates of Title I students for a program site in Utah showed major gains from 1991 through 1995. Statistics from this school indicate an average difference of 13.4 percentage points for grades K-5 in Basic Skills and an average difference of 14.7 percentage points in More Advanced Skills (Adams & Englemann, 1996). Less formal indicators of performance also show improvement for students in Direct Instruction Schools. For example, one school that had placed 24th in the district in its annual Math Olympics moved to second place in 1996.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Adams, G., & Englemann, S. (1996). *Research on Direct Instruction: 20 years beyond DISTAR*. Seattle, WA: Educational Achievement Systems.

Bereiter, C., & Kurland, M. (1981-82). A constructive look at Follow Through results. *Interchange, 12*, 1-22.

Englemann, S., Becker, W. C., Carnine, D., & Gersten, R. (1988). The Direct Instruction Follow Through Model: Design and outcomes. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 303-317.

114

Gersten, R., Kedating, T., & Becker, W. (1988). The continued impact of the Direct Instruction Model: Longitudinal studies of Follow Through students. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 318-327.

Stebbens, L. B., St. Pierre, R. G., Proper, E. C., Anderson, R. B., & Cerva, T. R. (1977). *Education as experimentation: A planned variation model.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

White, W. A. T. (1988). Main analysis of effects of Direct Instruction in special education. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 364-374.

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound

122 Mount Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Phone: 617-576-1260
Fax: 617-576-1340
Web: hugse1.harvard.edu/~elob/elobpage.htm

EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING OUTWARD BOUND

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

This program, designed for grades K-12, draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations—called learning expeditions—to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In program schools, students and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively, and tracking is eliminated.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Expeditionary Learning design is comprised of five core practices that build on one another to support high expectations and achievement in every area.

Learning expeditions. Learning expeditions involve planning and teaching of rigorous and purposeful learning expeditions, assessment of their effectiveness and the quality of student work, and revision and improvement of that work. Standards for each expedition are raised and met each year the expedition is taught. Assessment is woven throughout each learning expedition, pushing students to higher levels of performance in pursuit of academic excellence. Learning expeditions culminate in projects and performances that take students outside of school to conduct fieldwork, bring the outside world into the classroom, and engage students in real-world investigations both inside and outside of school.

Reflection and critique. These qualities are represented in program practices of collaborative assessment and of reflection on the part of teachers on their own work and that of their students in order to drive continuous improvement of teaching and learning. Examining student work helps teachers discover what students know and are able to do and how best they learn; sharing and critiquing among teachers of their own work helps teachers improve their craft in a collegial and respectful forum.

School culture. Expeditionary Learning schools promote a strong culture, emphasizing high expectations, high-quality work, community and collaboration, service, and the value of diversity. The culture fosters a community of teachers, students, administrators, and parents all pulling in the same direction to attain powerful teaching and high achievement in every domain for every student.

School structures. Expeditionary Learning requires the reorganization of time, student grouping, and resources to support high quality learning experiences. School schedules provide longer and more flexible blocks of time for project-based learning and fieldwork, common planning by teams of teachers, and community-building activities. Heterogeneous grouping allows all students to share in the richness that diversity brings to learning. Multi-year looping strengthens relationships in the classroom and improves the likelihood of academic success by allowing students to stay with the same teacher or team of teachers for more than one year.

School review. Expeditionary Learning schools engage in an annual cycle of reflection, planning, and action to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Schools look at student learning outcomes and qualitative and quantitative evidence of instructional practices to assess progress toward full implementation of the design, set priorities for improvement, and create an action plan for achieving those priorities. Expeditionary Learning benchmarks provide a framework for continuous improvement.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

GRADE LEVELS

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
Active learning
Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning

* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate

Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
Teacher models higher order thinking
Hands-on activities

* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student

Heterogeneous grouping
Student choice of learning activities

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment

Attend to foundation of basic skills
Learning processes
Authentic assessments

* Integration of content areas

Challenging academic content

* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments

Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction

* Parent involvement

School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)

* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement

Kindergarten
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses

* Positive schoolwide climate

Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision

* Small class size
* Shared decision making on school policies

Site-specific improvement plan

* Inclusive school

Encourage action research

IMPLEMENTATION

Each school does an annual self-review against Expeditionary Learning implementation benchmarks and student achievement objectives. Each faculty member in program schools is expected to be involved in 15-20 days a year of professional and curriculum development. A planned sequence of professional development activities includes orientation, visits to other program schools, on-site technical assistance, summer planning institutes, week-long intensive workshops or "summits," Outward Bound courses for teachers, and national conferences for school leadership and faculty.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Meet and go beyond standards established by school districts and states

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Since the first program schools opened in 1993, the Expeditionary Learning design has been the subject of evaluations by the RAND Corporation, the Academy for Educational Development, and the University of Colorado Department of Education. These evaluations and the regular testing programs of state and local educational authorities have found the program to be effective in significantly improving students' standardized test scores. For example, a middle school in Portland, ME obtained an average increase of 45 points in reading and 65 points in math on the Maine Educational Assessment compared to statewide increases of 5 points in reading and 25 points in math. In addition, teachers report a high and growing level of student involvement. Attendance at all Expeditionary Learning schools has shown improvement, averaging over 90%. Disciplinary problems have decreased in all program schools.

These evaluators indicate that a substantial majority of program teachers perceive that all students—both the most and the least advanced—are more motivated and more able to learn and flourish. A higher quality of student work is generally cited, and parents in each community report that their children are more engaged in school.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Armstrong, G. P., & Sakofs, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Into the classroom: The Outward Bound approach to teaching and learning*. Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Berger, R. (1996). *A culture of quality: A reflection on practice*. Providence, RI: Brown University, Annenburg Institute for School Reform. (Reprinted in *Journeys through our classrooms*, 1996).

Campbell, M., Archung, K., & Rugen, L. (1995). Teachers as active learners. *Cooperative Learning: The Magazine for Cooperation in Education. 15*(2).

Cousins, E., & Mednick, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Fieldwork II: An Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound Reader*. Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Cousins, E., & Rodgers, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Fieldwork I: An Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound Reader*. Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Hartl, S., & Rugen, L. (1994, November). What we are learning about learning. *Education Leadership*. (Reprinted in *Fieldwork I*, 1995).

Mednick, A., & Udall, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Journeys through our classrooms*. Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

New American Schools Development Corporation (1996). *New American Schools: A preview* (video). Alexandria, VA: Educational Commission of the States.

Richardson, L. (1993, October 31). Outwide the classroom experience: A school weans ideas from Outward Bound into lessons. *New York Times*, p. 37. (Reprinted in *Fieldwork I*, 1995).

Staples, L. (1984). *A manual for grassroots organizing*. New York: Praeger Special Studies.

High Schools That Work

Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30318-5790

Phone: 404-875-9211
Fax: 404-872-1477
Web: www.sreb.org/programs/hstw/high.html

High Schools That Work

Program Overview

High Schools That Work (HSTW) is a whole-school, research and assessment-based reform effort that offers a framework of goals and key practices for improving the academic, technical, and intellectual achievement of career-bound high school students. It provides intensive technical assistance, focused staff development, and a nationally recognized yardstick for measuring program effectiveness. The program promotes a changed school environment as a context for implementing 10 "key practices." High Schools That Work sets high expectations, identifies a recommended curriculum to meet expectations, and sets student performance goals benchmarked to the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Program Components

Three main ideas lay the foundation of this design:

- Academic and vocational teachers, principals, and counselors, working together, need to establish unity of vision, a common process for reorganizing the school, and a plan for doing so.
- Teachers and school leaders are empowered to accomplish their goals when they share expertise and learn from each other.
- Assessment, evaluation, and feedback should drive the process and implementation of reform.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum

Students Served

Urban students
Rural students

Grade Levels

High Schools That Work is a comprehensive reform program for the high school grades.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Adaptive instructional strategies
  Use of technology
  Student choice of learning activities

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Authentic assessments
* Integration of content areas
  Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  School restructuring
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
  Site-specific improvement plan

IMPLEMENTATION

HSTW has 22 member states as well as other sites nationwide that implement the program. The program provides technical assistance, staff development, communications, and assessment. Member states designate a coordinator for networks of HSTW states and create technical assistance networks of HSTW experts within the state. In addition, each HSTW site has a designated coordinator for activities at the local level.

In member states, sites must receive approval to join HSTW from the state department of education. Sites must also demonstrate that: (a) the majority of faculty are committed to supporting the HSTW framework; (b) they will conduct at least a 5-year school improvement plan as detailed by the HSTW program; and (c) the school will participate in the HSTW assessment program. In addition to these conditions, sites in nonmember states must demonstrate that two-thirds of the faculty are committed to support the HSTW framework of goals and key practices.

Training includes a 2-day site development workshop, a 4-day annual national HSTW conference, a national leadership forum for state policymakers, a 3-day retreat for system/school leaders, a 3-day technical assistance leadership training workshop for district and state leaders, and 2 weekend workshops. In the first year of implementation, sites receive at least 2 follow-up visits addressing the site action plan. In year 2, sites receive a 3-day team technical assistance visit. In year 3, sites receive assistance in using data to update their site action plans and receive customized technical assistance and training. HSTW also provides teleconferences that link developing schools with sites that have overcome challenges in raising student achievement. The Southern Regional Education Board, HSTW's governing body, collects information from technical assistance visits, a biennial assessment, a teacher survey report, and annual progress reports submitted by schools.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Higher student achievement in reading, mathematics, and science, as measured by the High Schools That Work assessment, which is based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress

PROGRAM EFFECTS

All sites are required to participate in the HSTW Assessment, which is based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress and involves achievement tests in reading, mathematics, and science of senior students about to complete a vocational or technical concentration. HSTW sites that participated in the assessment in 1994 and again in 1996 showed significant improvement in average reading and mathematics scores. Furthermore, the percentage of career-bound students at these sites meeting the HSTW performance goals increased from 33% in 1994 to 43% in 1996 in reading, and from 34% to 44% in mathematics. Schools that were in the network longer showed more evidence of putting the key practices into place and had higher performance than new sites.

Qualitative information collected through five case studies of improving sites, technical assistance visits, and annual progress reports suggests that, when sites make progress in implementing the key practices, they tend to get the following results: improved achievement and higher attendance, graduation, retention, and postsecondary attendance rates. Likewise, dropout rates and discipline referrals tend to decline. High-achieving schools in the top 25% of HSTW sites with diverse student populations show significant improvement in curriculum, instructional practices, and performance indicators (See Bottoms & HSTW Staff, 1997; Smith, Hayward, Powell, & Padillo, 1998).

Related Publications

Bottoms, G., & High Schools That Work Staff (1997). *High Schools That Work Research Brief* (Nos. 1 and 9). Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Bottoms, G., & Mikos, P. (1995). *Seven most-improved High Schools That Work sites raise achievement in reading, mathematics and science*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Emanuel, D., Joyner, N., Bradby, D., Creech, B., & Bottoms, G. (1997). *Working together to change practice and accelerate student learning*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board; and Berkeley, CA: MPR Associates.

Smith, T., Hayward, B., Powell, J., & Padillo, C. (1998). *Identification and assessment of integrated curricular approaches which promise school reform*. Washington, DC: Research Triangle Institute, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education.

MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE

208 23rd Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37203

Phone: 615-320-8804
Fax: 615-320-5366
Web: www.mrsh.org/

Modern Red Schoolhouse

Program Overview

Modern Red Schoolhouse strives to help all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum for primary, middle, and upper grades; use of traditional and performance-based assessments; establishment of effective organizational patterns and professional development programs; and implementation of effective community involvement strategies. Students master the rigorous curriculum, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government.

Program Components

The Modern Red Schoolhouse program works with each school in the areas of organization and finance; community involvement; curriculum; standards and assessment; and professional development. Each school establishes task forces in these key areas to plan and execute school restructuring efforts.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learning, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

Students Served

All students

Grade Levels

Modern Red Schoolhouse is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-12.

Program Practices

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

Classroom Practices

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Use of technology
  Student choice of learning activities

Curriculum Assessment

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Integration of content areas
  Challenging academic content
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments
  Multicultural content

School Organization and Climate

  Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  School restructuring
  Consensus building (to initiate or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
  Kindergarten
  Prevention oriented
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Flexible scheduling
  Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
  Coordinated school-linked services
  Site-specific improvement plan
  Site-based governance
* Inclusive school

IMPLEMENTATION

Successful implementation of the design begins with the support of the entire school community. All staff members participate in the planning and curriculum development phases of the program, with the staff implementing the agreed-upon plans and strategies. Curriculum in program schools is aligned with both program and state standards and must be developed within a 3-year period. The program recommends an 80% vote of the staff in favor of implementing the design but recognizes that a school should determine locally the necessary percentage to develop full support for implementation. In addition, the relevant governing boards (school board or state agency) must show commitment to the Modern Red Schoolhouse program

The planning phase is intended to produce a detailed strategy and time line for implementing the design at a particular school. This plan, negotiated with Modern Red Schoolhouse staff, allows schools to build upon their previous improvement efforts and to incorporate the best of their existing practices. District-level planning is needed to assure flexibility in implementing the design.

An average of 20 days of professional development for each teacher per year takes place at Modern Red Schoolhouse sites. Teachers who serve in various leadership roles receive additional training. The majority of the training occurs during the school year, but summer institutes of 3-5 days' duration are also offered. All teachers receive a foundation in the following topics:

- Change process and becoming standards-driven
- Modern Red Schoolhouse standards and performance levels
- Developing a schoolwide curriculum scope and sequence
- Writing Hudson Foundation Units
- Modern Red Schoolhouse assessments

School-based training includes orientation and follow-up sessions for each design element and leadership development for principals and task force chairs. Modern Red Schoolhouse staff and consultants make regular school visits to give on-site training.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Mastery of basic skills
- Studies in a foreign language, the arts, physical fitness, and health
- Broad appreciation of the culture of the U.S. and of other nations
- Work skills merged throughout curriculum

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Across multiple sites, the test scores of students in Modern Red Schoolhouse elementary schools have increased. At Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx, for example, 52% of the students passed New York's essential skills test in reading in 1995, and 82% passed in math, up from 22% and 47%, respectively, 2 years earlier. At Rozelle Creative and Performing Arts School in Memphis, all students met or exceeded 90% of the district median percentiles on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program in 1996. In addition, fourth-grade writing proficiency scores improved more than 100%. Average gains in the proportion of students meeting Texas minimum expectations for program schools in San Antonio were greater than districtwide average gains in 80% of comparisons by grade (3, 4, and 5) and subject (math, writing, and reading) for 1996-97.

In a 1995 survey of all elementary teachers at program sites, the majority of teachers reported that the curriculum (90%), the design (66%), and the use of computers (90%) had a positive impact on student achievement. Additionally, 100% of teachers reported that they were strongly satisfied with their roles as professionals.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Kilgore, S. (Ed.) (1997). *Designing schools for the 21st century: Essential elements of a Modern Red Schoolhouse, Vol. 2.1*. Nashville, TN: Modern Red Schoolhouse.

Heady, R., & Kilgore, S. (Eds.). (1996). Modern Red Schoolhouse. In S. Stringfield, S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.) *Bold plans for school restructuring* (139-178) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Purpose-Centered Education/Audrey Cohen College

75 Varrick Street
New York, NY 10013-1919

Phone: 212-343-1234, Ext. 3400
Fax: 212-343-8470
Web: www.audrey-cohen.edu/open.html

PURPOSE-CENTERED EDUCATION/AUDREY COHEN COLLEGE

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Purpose-Centered Education Program for grades K-12 runs under the auspices of Audrey Cohen College, an accredited, private, nonprofit institution of higher education. Since its founding in 1964, the College has been dedicated to preparing individuals to assume leadership roles in a rapidly changing world. The College has adapted its educational system for elementary and secondary schools to serve the learning needs of all students.

Purpose-Centered Education focuses all student learning on a meaningful, overarching "Purpose" that contributes to the world at large. Students achieve the semester's purpose by planning, carrying out, and evaluating a "Constructive Action" in which they use their knowledge and skills to benefit their community and the larger world. In using what they know and applying what they learn, students not only achieve a meaningful goal but also learn to be effective and caring citizens able to manage their lives and help to make the world a better place.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

In the early grades, each class addresses its purpose as a group, planning and implementing a Constructive Action in the community with the guidance of the teacher. Older students plan and implement their own individual constructive actions with teacher involvement. Twenty-four enriching, developmentally appropriate purposes have been established, generally one for each semester at each grade level.

All school subjects, from mathematics and science to language arts and social studies, are refocused to relate to each semester's purpose. Instead of taking classes separated by subject area, students take "dimension" classes which incorporate different subjects and a variety of skills. The classes teach students how to use knowledge and skills to achieve their purpose through research, goal-setting, effective communication, and teamwork. Examples include: We Work for Safety (grade 1); We Help People Through the Arts (grade 3); and I Use Science and Technology to Help Shape a Just and Productive Society (grade 10).

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Improve school climate

- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All general education students
Title I students
Urban students
Rural students

GRADE LEVELS

Purpose-Centered Education/Audrey Cohen College is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructive strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
  Teacher as facilitator
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
  Heterogeneous grouping
  Use of technology
  Student choice of learning activities
  Multiple intelligences

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
  Authentic assessments
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
  Challenging academic content
* Use of individual learning plans
* Frequent assessments
  Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

  Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Shared school vision
* Inclusive school
  Encourage action research

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation in the first year includes 5 days of orientation for teachers and administrators. During that time, teachers and administrators receive intensive training in the College Purpose-Centered System of Education and are thoroughly introduced to planning and functioning within a purpose-centered approach to learning. The orientation is organized by an Orientation Coordinator and a team of school trainers in cooperation with a district-appointed liaison and within the scope of the district's requirement.

Audrey Cohen College personnel provide ongoing support throughout the school year. The number of days of direct contact is generally determined by the College in cooperation with the district. The College maintains a long-term relationship with districts and schools through regular visits in order to work with teachers, students, and principals; train teachers; align district and state policies and procedures with the Purpose-Centered System of Education; and help further the use of technology to advance teaching and learning. Teachers in existing Audrey Cohen College schools also work with teachers in schools that are new to the system.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- 24 essential abilities that fuse knowledge with action

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Student performance on standardized achievement and local criterion-referenced test scores have met or exceeded school and district expectations. For Louisa May Alcott Elementary School in San Diego, CA, third-grade reading scores increased by 13%; language scores increased by 6%; and math scores increased by 7% from 1991-92 to 1996-97, as reported by the San Diego City Schools Information Services Bureau. Seventh- and eighth-grade students in a Memphis, TN high school registered consistent and sizable gains between spring 1995 and spring 1997 on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program, according to a report from the Office of Research and Evaluation, Memphis City Schools. A report from Dade County, FL Public Schools indicates that, during the 1995-96 school year, students from Everglades Elementary School demonstrated an average increase of 4 points across all grades (1-5) in reading comprehension, 6 points in math computation, and 4 points in math applications, as measured by the SAT.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Bodily, S. (1996). Lessons learned: RAND's formative assessment of NAS's phase 2 demonstration effort. In S. Stringfield, S. M. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold Plans for School Restructuring* (pp. 289-324). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cohen, A. (1993). A new educational paradigm. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(10), 91-95.

Cohen, A., & Jordan, J. (1996). Audrey Cohen College system of education: Purpose-Centered Education. In S. Stringfield, S. M. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold Plans for School Restructuring* (pp. 25-51), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Till, F., & Jordan, J. (1997). Learning with purpose. *The American School Board Journal. 184*(9), 44-45.

ROOTS AND WINGS

The Johns Hopkins University
Center for the Social
Organization of Schools
3505 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218-3888

Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-516-8890
Web: www.successforall.com

ROOTS AND WINGS

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Roots and Wings builds on the widely used Success for All reading program and incorporates science, history, and mathematics to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the design is that schools must do whatever it takes to assure that all students succeed. To this end, Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other services. While the "roots" of the design refer to mastery of basics, the "wings" represent advanced accomplishments that students achieve through interdisciplinary projects and a challenging curriculum provided by the design.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The kindergarten program is designed to ensure that students start first grade with good language and prereading skills. In grades 1-5, reading emphasizes active instruction and cooperative learning. "Reading Wings," which involves students in cooperative learning, begins in the second grade. In the "MathWings" program students work together on hands-on activities. The "WorldLab" program prepares students to solve complex social and scientific problems. The main elements of the program are phased in over a 3-year period. One-on-one tutoring is provided by certified teacher/tutors to first graders having serious reading difficulty.

A family support team is established to develop home-school links and support parents in ensuring their children's success. In addition, a building advisory committee helps to shape program policy and to guide development.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase student-directed learning
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

All students

Grade Levels

Roots and Wings is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades K-6.

Program Practices

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

Classroom Practices

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
* Student-directed learning
* Direct instruction
* Small-group instruction
* Frequent high-quality social interaction among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Teacher modeling of attitudes, behaviors, and skills
  Teacher models higher order thinking
  Hands-on activities
* Adaptive instructional strategies
* Peer tutoring
* Tutoring-teacher/aide and student

Curriculum Assessment

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
  Attend to foundation of basic skills
  Learning processes
* Tailored to student ability and academic background
* Integration of content areas
* Tailored to student cultural background
  Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments
  Multicultural content

School Organization and Climate

* Parent involvement
  School restructuring
  Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)

* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Community involvement
  Kindergarten
  Prevention oriented
  Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate
  Shared school vision
* Small class size
* Shared decision making on school policies
  Site-based governance
* Inclusive school
  Pullout for instruction

IMPLEMENTATION

The most important requirement of Roots and Wings is that schools implementing the program have district support for adopting the program, commitment of the principal, and a vote by secret ballot of at least 80% of the teaching staff.

Roots and Wings provides training sessions in the components of the program, offering demonstration lessons and follow-up expert coaching as well as peer coaching. In addition, school staff may visit other Roots and Wings schools and share videotapes of what teachers in other schools are doing. Training includes classroom teachers in all subjects—including art, music, and physical education—as well as other school staff. A full-time facilitator is needed to provide ongoing assistance to teachers. The facilitator should be supported with a budget for training and travel to training sessions.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Enhanced student performance on achievement assessments

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Research on Roots and Wings indicates substantial positive effects of the program in all curricular areas. On the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program, students in four high-poverty pilot schools in rural St. Mary's County gained significantly more than other Maryland students in reading, writing, language, social studies, and science between 1993 and 1996. These schools, in which 48% of students qualified for free lunch, began far below the state average. By 1996, they were scoring at or above state averages in all subjects in grades 3 and 5.

In addition, a substantial body of research has established the effectiveness of the reading, writing, and language arts components of Roots and Wings. The results of these evaluations indicate that the program increases reading performance, especially for students who perform in the lowest 25% of their class. Evaluations over time in 11 school districts illustrate that, on average, students score about 3 months higher

than control groups in first grade, and 1.1 years higher in fifth grade on reading measures. Evaluations also indicate positive impacts on the achievement of limited-English proficient students being instructed in English or Spanish and on students assigned to special education. Retention and special education placements decline significantly in program schools. A Texas study of MathWings also found positive effects of that program element (Madden, Slavin, & Simons, 1997; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996; Slavin et al., 1996; Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996).

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Simons, K. (1997). *MathWings: Early indicators of effectiveness*. Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). *Every child, every school: Success for All*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S., Smith, L., & Dianda, M. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*, 41-76.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Roots and Wings. In S. Stringfield, S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold plans for educational reform: The New American Schools*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Howard University
Holy Cross Hall, Room 427
2900 Van Ness Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Phone: 202-806-8498
Fax: 202-806-8498
Web: http://scov.csos.jhu.edu/talent/talent.html

The Johns Hopkins University
3003 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218-3888

Phone: 410-516-8800
Fax: 410-516-8890
Web: http://scov.csos.jhu.edu/talent/talent.html

Talent Development Schools

Program Overview

The mission of Talent Development Schools, a program initiated by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) at Howard University and The Johns Hopkins University, is to conduct the research, development, evaluation, and dissemination needed to transform schooling for students placed at risk. Talent Development Elementary Schools, High Schools, and Middle Schools hold all students to high standards, providing multiple pathways that ensure success.

Program Goals

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Foster positive student perceptions
- Increase equity in opportunity to learn
- Restructure school organization
- Increase family involvement
- Improve school climate
- Enrich curriculum and instruction

Students Served

All students
Title I students
Urban students

Grade Levels

Talent Development Schools are comprehensive reform programs implemented in elementary, middle, and high schools.

Program Practices

Classroom Practices

* High expectations for students
* Frequent high-quality academic interactions among teachers and students
  Active learning
  Teacher as facilitator
* Frequent high-quality social interactions among teachers and students
* Cooperative learning
* Positive classroom climate
  Hands-on activities
* Peer tutoring

Heterogeneous grouping
Use of technology
Student choice of learning activities

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Attend to foundation of basic skills
* Tailored to student cultural background
Challenging academic content
* Frequent assessments
Multicultural content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
School restructuring
Consensus building (to initiate and/or sustain program)
* Principal as facilitator and support provider
* Positive schoolwide climate
Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
* Inclusive school
Encourage action research

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Improved student academic performance
- Improved attendance
- Improved student social competence in making school transitions
- Improved pedagogy, classroom climate, and teacher effectiveness
- Improved student school-to-career transition

The following are profiles of Talent Development programs for all grade levels affiliated with Howard University and Johns Hopkins University, respectively.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Talent Development Elementary School program at Howard University is a comprehensive school reform model developed at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) at Howard University. It is based on the philosophy that *all* students can learn to high standards where high expectations are held by all stakeholders and where there is clear accountability for academic success and personal development by the students themselves, school staff, parents, and the community.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

While the Talent Development reform model is a co-constructive model that is molded to fit the context of each school in which it is implemented, there are eight components that are considered essential to bring about the type of comprehensive reform that is desired:

- A *curriculum* aligned with state and district standards that is culturally relevant and challenging and that builds on students' interests, preferences, and existing competencies. This entails a curriculum that develops character and socioemotional proficiency as well as acquisition of knowledge. The curriculum also emphasizes thematic integration across all subjects and technological fluency. Curriculum enhancements for reading and mathematics are designed by Howard University staff.
- *Multiple approaches to instructional methods*, including flexible grouping and evidence-based techniques that are culturally sensitive, promote intrinsic motivation and active learning on the part of students in classrooms where students' questions are welcomed and voices can be frequently heard.
- *Assessment* measures are aligned to a standards-based curriculum. Frequent and broad-scoped assessment is sensitive to the assets and test-taking strengths of all students, measuring growth as well as absolute achievement.
- *Supports* are provided to fortify students in both their academic and personal development in the form of in-school and after-school tutoring and mentoring, co-curricular activities, field trips, summer enrichment programs, and access to comprehensive health and social services.
- *Peer based initiatives* include peer learning and tutoring, peer governance, peer mediation, and peer evaluation.
- *Professional development* is ongoing at the school site and meets both career and workplace needs of the teachers as well as promoting the Talent Development philosophy, which encourages teachers to reflect on their own

practices and to hone in on students' assets by becoming researchers in their own classrooms.

- *Family/community/school partnerships* serve the students and the community in concrete ways. Family and community members are actively involved in both social and academic programs on a daily basis.
- The *organizational structure* of the school is based on democratic governance with administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and community members participating in innovative practices designed to meet the agreed-upon ends of the school in a facility that is clean, safe, and aesthetically conducive to learning and teaching. Such practices may include small learning communities, team teaching with common planning periods, looping, and flexible scheduling.

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation usually takes the following form. After initial contact is made between the school and the Howard University CRESPAR team, members of the team meet with the School Restructuring Team, which includes a teachers' union representative, school administrators, counselors, teachers, parents, and community members. Team members visit the school on several occasions. If the decision is made to proceed with implementation, the Talent Development team meets with the entire staff to present the model to them and administer a survey designed to ascertain the degree of alignment between the philosophy of the teaching staff and that represented by the Talent Development model. At least 80% of the teachers must have attitudes and beliefs that are aligned with the model for the program to proceed within a given school.

After a memorandum of understanding is signed by the principal and the superintendent, background information on the school's curriculum, test results, attendance records, and other pertinent information are obtained and reviewed by program staff. Howard University Talent Development staff then meet with small groups of teachers and staff in subject- or activity-related groups to ascertain their perceived needs, strengths and weaknesses. Feedback is offered to school staff. This approach has proven to be empowering to the staff and effective in obtaining staff buy-in. A teacher liaison is selected either on recommendation of the principal or through teacher or team selection. This individual assists in coordinating activities between program and school staff. Letters are sent to each student's family informing them of the project and explaining the potential benefits to their child.

Program staff maintain a presence in the school on a weekly basis, attend staff meetings, and supply personnel assistance in monitoring attendance, tutoring, and parent activities. They also assist the school in finding community partners and other resources. A full-time, on-site facilitator will be the key implementor. Professional development sessions are conducted by program staff, outside consultants, or internal staff with special expertise.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- Development, in students, of marketable and personally-valued skills; broad-ranged intellectual competence; socioemotional proficiency, including character and leadership development; an increased sense of community and social responsibility; cultural empowerment, and ease in making school and developmental transitions
- Improved school and classroom climate
- Improved professional conditions for school personnel
- Improved school/family/community relations

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Underlying the Talent Development program is the belief that each school classroom has its own cultural character. It has been demonstrated by program researchers that, when classroom cultural contexts are expanded to include a diversity of cultural themes, problem-solving performance, learning, motivation, and psychosocial development are enhanced for students who would otherwise fare poorly in school. Furthermore, culturally relevant after-school programs coupled with family, community, and school partnership initiatives can lead to increases in students' school-related social competence, reductions in classroom disruptive behaviors, and reductions in disciplinary referrals.

For additional evidence of the program effects of the Talent Development model, refer to sections describing Talent Development Middle School and Talent Development High School.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Boykin, A. W. (1994). Harvesting culture and talent: African American children and educational reform. In R. Rossi (Ed.), *Schools and students at risk: Context and framework for positive change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Boykin, A. W. (1996, April). *A talent development approach to school reform: An introduction to the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Madhere, S. (1998, January). *Talent development and transcultural pedagogy*. Paper presented at the Third Bi-national Conference on Border Pedagogy, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico.

Towns, D. P. (1998). *Transmitting Anglo-American cultural values in classrooms serving African American children: The interplay between culture and language* (Tech. Rep., The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk). Washington, DC: Howard University; and Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT MIDDLE SCHOOL
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Talent Development Middle School program at Howard University is a comprehensive school reform model developed at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) at Howard University. It is based on the philosophy that *all* students can learn to high standards where high expectations are held by all stakeholders and where there is clear accountability for academic success and personal development by the students themselves, school staff, parents, and the community.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

There are eight fundamental components to the Talent Development model:

- A curriculum aimed at active learning
- Emphasis on cultural empowerment
- Communal organization of school
- Total de-tracking of instruction
- Growth-oriented assessment
- Multilayered pedagogy
- Career exploration
- Family affirmation

IMPLEMENTATION

Most implementation activities follow the same process as that described for Talent Development Elementary School/Howard University (see above). On the middle school level, implementation begins with the scaffolding of activities in support of learning. These include after-school tutoring, a career fair, and an academic recognition program. After a semester the core instructional component is introduced.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- Broadened teacher perceptions of students
- Transformed school climate
- Improved instruction, making it more coherent and interactive
- Increased student achievement in reading, mathematics, science, and cultural literacy
- Establishment of a trajectory to future educational accomplishments and life successes for each child

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The Talent Development Middle School site in Washington, DC serves a school where 90% of the student population is eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Although the implementation of the model was incremental, positive effects were realized by the end of the first year.

Data on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) were collected in 1995-96 for a cohort of eighth-grade students (Madhere, 1998). Pre- and posttest scores were examined. The analysis included data for a comparison group made up of students attending 5 similar middle and junior high schools in adjacent areas, and the District in general. The results showed that, while the average reading score for the District went down by 4 NCE points, at the Talent Development test site there was a modest increase of 1 point. The results were encouraging not only because they were favorable in cross-sectional comparisons but also because they signaled the reversal of a multi-year declining trend for the school.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Madhere, S. (in press). Better school discipline: From containment to engagement. *The Principal.*

Madhere, S., & MacIver, D. (1996). *The Talent Development Middle School: Essential components* (Rep. No. 3, The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk). Washington, DC: Howard University; and Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.

Madhere, S. (1998, January). *Talent development and transcultural pedagogy.* Paper presented at the Third Bi-national Conference on Border Pedagogy, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT HIGH SCHOOL
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Talent Development High School program at Howard University is a comprehensive school reform model developed at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) at Howard University. It is based on the philosophy that *all* students can learn to high standards where high expectations are held by all students, teachers, administrators, staff, parents, and community representatives. Exemplary secondary school environments are created where all students are placed at promise for success with clear accountability for academic achievement and personal development by all stakeholders.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Talent Development High School model incorporates the following components:

- *Smaller student, teacher, and staff learning communities, Academies, Schools-within-schools, or Houses*: includes ninth-grade transitional community, upper grade school-to-career focused groupings, de-centralized administration, teaching with common planning periods, and flexible scheduling
- *Professional development*: includes on- and offsite continuing education for teachers, staff, and administration that meets both career and workplace needs, uses Talent Development philosophy, and views teachers as reflective practitioners
- *Learning tutorial program*: includes tutoring by peers, parents, and other community members; tutorial training, monitoring, and evaluation; and in-school and after-school programming
- *School-to-career program*: includes experientially-based resources on job training, employment, and college opportunities such as skill-building exercises, career interest inventories, and listings for internship and employment opportunities, to be used by parents and community members as well as students
- *School, family, and community partnership program*: provides education, training, and empowerment for parents using the Partnership 2000 Model; includes school-based parent resource center, provides training of parents as assistants to teachers and other staff, and monitors student academic achievement and conduct
- *Curriculum improvements*: ensures that curriculum is aligned with state and district standards, and that it is culturally relevant, and challenging; builds on students' interests, preferences, and existing competencies; and emphasizes thematic integration across all subjects and technological fluency (curriculum enhancements are designed by Howard University staff)
- *Instructional improvements*: includes multiple approaches such as flexible grouping and active learning as well as cultural sensitivity
- *Assessment improvements*: aligned to standards-based curriculum; frequent, broad-based, and sensitive; geared to student assets and test-taking strengths; incorporates growth-oriented and absolute achievement measures
- *Academic supports*: includes co-curricular activities, field trips, mentoring program, summer enrichment program, and access to comprehensive health and social services
- *Peer-based initiatives*: includes peer learning, governance, counseling, mediation, and evaluation
- *Organizational structure*: democratic and consensus governance management style for students, teachers, administrators, staff, parents, and community members; school is clean, safe, and aesthetically conducive to learning

IMPLEMENTATION

See Talent Development Elementary School (above).

EXPECTED OUTCOMES

- Development, in students, of marketable and personally-valued skills
- Broad-ranged intellectual competence
- Socioemotional proficiency, including character and leadership development
- Increased sense of community and social responsibility
- Cultural empowerment
- Ease in making school and life transitions
- Improved school and classroom climate
- Improved professional conditions for school personnel
- Improved school/family/community relations

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Program effects include increased cohesion and morale among ninth-grade teachers, increased parent involvement in school, and improved school climate. Teachers and administrators have reported that the sustained presence of university scholars from the Talent Development team in staff meetings and teacher planning sessions has not only raised teacher morale but has also stimulated professional growth and challenged teachers to improve the quality of their teaching. Students who used to leave school early are now staying behind to attend the After-School Study Center, where they interact with Howard University students, who serve as tutors and mentors four days a week. Parental participation through the establishment of the school/family/community action team is unprecedented, and parents have now been given an actual operational base in the school. These improvements have provided the stage for continued reform activities to impact student attendance, student achievement, and continued professional development for teachers and staff.

RELATED PUBLICATION

LaPoint, V. L., Jordan, W., McPartland, J. M., & Towns, D. P. (1996). *The Talent Development High School—Essential Components*. (Tech. Rep., The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.) Washington, DC: Howard University; and Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 399 662).

TALENT DEVELOPMENT MIDDLE SCHOOL
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Talent Development Middle School program at Johns Hopkins Universigty is a rigorously evaluated national whole-school reform model developed by researchers, educators, and experienced curriculum writers from the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) at The Johns Hopkins University. The program was founded in 1995. There are currently four program sites (three in Philadelphia, PA and one in Washington, DC).

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Talent Development Middle School contains eight fundamental components that transform a school into a high-performance learning community by establishing the standards-driven curriculum, instruction, school organization, and professional development needed in order for all students to learn challenging academic material and prepare for successful futures. Key elements of the reform include:

- Student Team Literature, an innovative, thoroughly tested, and highly effective cooperative learning approach to teaching and learning in Reading, English, and Language Arts
- A research- and standards-based mathematics curriculum built around materials developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project
- A hands-on, inquiry-oriented science curriculum linked to national science standards
- An eighth-grade U.S. History course built around Joy Hakim's award-winning multicultural and narrative *History of US* series
- New approaches to providing frequent extra help in mathematics or reading to students who need it in order to succeed at the challenging learning tasks they face
- Innovative approaches to school organization and staffing that allow teachers, students, and families to establish strong bonds and close, caring relationships
- Three-year career and education exploration course
- Partnership 2000 model for establishing strategic school-family partnerships
- Focused and sustained professional development in all subject areas with follow-up in-school support by highly trained facilitators
- Emphasis on promoting cultural empowerment

IMPLEMENTATION

Focused and sustained staff development and in-classroom support are key components of the Talent Development Middle School model. The first tier of support is comprehensive, ongoing, and subject-specific staff development. In each subject area, teachers engage in a multi-year sequence of professional development that focuses on instructional strategies, content knowledge, and modeling and previewing

of upcoming lessons. The English/Reading, Mathematics, Science, and U.S. History instructional programs require 30 to 50 hours of professional development each during the first year (including the prior summer) they are being implemented. They require 10 to 30 hours during the second year of implementation.

A subject area facilitator provides the second tier of support. This individual is a skilled and intensively trained school district teacher who is placed on special assignment to the Talent Development program. Each subject area facilitator typically works with 2-3 schools at a time during implementation years and spends 1-2 days a week at each school providing in-class support, including modeling, troubleshooting, peer coaching, meeting with small groups of teachers, and making sure that teachers have the supplies and materials necessary to implement the program.

School-level personnel provide the third tier of support. One of the goals of the Talent Development Middle School is to identify at least two teachers in each major subject area in the school who are trained during the implementation year to become the in-school support staff. Over time these teachers play increasingly larger roles, providing leadership and training of new teachers.

The Johns Hopkins Talent Development staff provides the fourth and final tier of teacher support. This staff is comprised of expert teachers in each instructional program who are in weekly phone contact with each school's subject area facilitator and/or school personnel. These individuals also make several annual visits to the school to review its progress and assist with staff development and planning.

In order to become a Talent Development Middle School, 80% of the faculty and professional staff must vote in favor of the proposition by secret ballot.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Subject matter mastery
- Performance on standardized achievement tests

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Central East Middle School became the first Talent Development Middle School in Philadelphia during the spring of 1995. Over the past 2 years, the school has experienced, strong, broad-based, and sustained achievement gains. An analysis of the Stanford 9 reading comprehension test administered in April, 1996 showed that, controlling for prior achievement, Central East students typically outgained their grade-level peers at a demographically matched comparison school by almost 12 points.

Of particular note is the fact that Central East Middle School witnessed a 10.9 percentage point gain in the number of students scoring better than basic in reading

and an 8.4 percentage point decline in the number of students scoring below basic. Of the 17 other large middle schools in Philadelphia comparable to Central East with poverty rates between the high 70s and low 90s, only one other school showed similar progress to Central East in reading achievement.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

MacIver, D. J., & Plank, S. B. (1996). *Creating a motivational climate conducive to talent development in middle schools: Implementation and effects of student team reading.* (Rep. No. 4, The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk). Washington, DC: Howard University; and Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.

MacIver, D. J., Plank, S. B., & Balfanz, R. (1997). *Working together to become proficient readers: Early impact of the Talent Development Middle School's student team literature program.* (Rep. No. 15, The Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk). Washington, DC: Howard University; and Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.

MacIver, D. J., & Plank, S. B. (1998). Improving urban schools: Developing the talents of students placed at risk. In J. L. Irvin (Ed.), *What current research says to the middle level practitioner* (pp. 243-256). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Useem, E. (1998). *Teachers' appraisals of Talent Development Middle School training, materials, and student progress: Results from six focus groups at Central East Middle School and Cooke Middle School.* Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Education Fund.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT HIGH SCHOOL
THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Talent Development High School program at Johns Hopkins University is a comprehensive, multiphased reform model for large high schools that have serious problems of student attendance, discipline, achievement scores, and dropout rates. The program is specific in the required school organization and curriculum changes required. Nevertheless, there is ample room to meet local conditions and to earn local ownership. The first phase of program reforms consists of changes in school organization and management to establish a safe and serious climate for learning and to motivate regular attendance by students and staff. The second phase includes improvements in curriculum and classroom instruction to better engage students in their own learning and to produce greater growth in student achievement of higher order learning goals.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

A separate transitional program, the Ninth Grade Success Academy, is provided for students in their first year of high school. This program places the students in small interdisciplinary teams of 4 or 5 teachers who share the same 150-180 students and a block schedule with common planning time. The program is housed in a separate part of the school, and a separate management team is responsible for its leadership. Numerous activities are structured to prepare students to make a wise choice of a Career Academy, the program they choose for the ensuing high school years.

Several self-contained Career Academies are formed to enroll 250-350 students in grades 10-12. The Career Academies are developed by faculty based on instructional strengths, labor market opportunities, and provision of a mix of choices covering the major broad career clusters and student personalities. Each Career Academy offers the same core of demanding academic courses with an appropriate blend of relevant career applications, making college entry possible for its students. Each Academy has its own faculty for both academic and career-focused courses. In addition, each Academy has its own management team, including Academy Principal and Academy Instructional Leader (drawn from previous school-wide assistant principals and department chairs). Guidance counselors are also assigned to each Academy.

An alternative after-hours program, the Twilight School, is conducted at the site for students with serious attendance or discipline problems or those who attend school from prison or who have been suspended from another school. Instruction is offered in small classes in the basic subjects, and extensive services are provided by guidance and support staff. The goal is for these students to earn their way back to regular day school after a 4- or 5-week period by developing skills for coping with school. Teachers are drawn from the regular day school faculty.

IMPLEMENTATION

Schools that are interested in this program can view videos made at Patterson High School and examine the program prospectus, *Considerations for Becoming a Talent Development High School*. The application process involves initial planning and design. A schoolwide vote of at least 80% is required for participation. Program personnel are available to participating schools for technical assistance, support networks, and further planning and implementation.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- School disciplinary climate
- Student attendance
- Student promotion and graduation rates
- Student test scores
- Parental involvement

PROGRAM EFFECTS

Evaluation data is drawn from the first 2 years of implementation at the first Talent Development demonstration site, Patterson High School in Baltimore, Maryland. Over the past 3 years, Patterson has increased its attendance rate by 10 percentage points for its ninth grade students. Over the same period, from 1993-1997, the average attendance rate in Baltimore's other high schools declined 3 percentage points. Improved attendance at Patterson has played a major role in increasing the promotion rate. The number of juniors and seniors nearly doubled over the study period, increasing from 449 in 1994 to 792 in 1998. As a result, the school is no longer dominated by ninth graders.

During the 1996-97 school year, ninth-grade teachers at Patterson found that the improved climate and increased student attendance made it possible to mount a sustained campaign to improve the "pass rate" on the State Functional Exams, particularly in math and writing. Patterson saw a 20-point increase that year in the number of students passing the math exam, and a 12-point increase in the number of students passing the writing exam.

The state of Maryland uses a school performance index based on attendance, retention, and test scores. In 1994-95, Patterson had the second worst school performance index among the 9 nonselective comprehensive high schools in Baltimore. By 1996-97, Patterson had the second highest index score within the same group.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. (CRESPAR). (1998). *Considerations for becoming a Talent Development High School.* Baltimore, MD: Author.

McPartland, J., Jordan, W., Legters, N., & Balfanz, R. (1997). Finding safety in small numbers. *Educational Leadership, 55*(2), 14-17.

McPartland, J., Balfanz, R., Jordan, W., & Legters, N. (in press). Improving climate and achievement in a troubled urban high school through the Talent Development model with Career Academies. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk.* Anticipated publication: October, 1998. Available until then through *CRESPAR Reports*, The Johns Hopkins University.

Vadeiro, D. (1996, June 12). Environmental studies: Researchers and educators have teamed up to find out how to make the climate at one beleaguered city school more conducive to learning. *Education Week*, pp. 14-17.

URBAN LEARNING CENTER

Los Angeles Educational Partnership
315 West 9th Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Phone: 213-622-5237, ext. 139
Fax: 213-629-5288
Web: www.lalc.k12.ca.us/lalc/

URBAN LEARNING CENTER

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Urban Learning Center is a comprehensive design for urban schools that calls for their reinvention into Pre-K-12 articulated communities. The design is the product of the work of experienced teachers and other educators, parents, community members, curriculum developers, technology specialists and managerial consultants. Initially, the design was implemented in 2 schools in Los Angeles and is now operating in 19 schools in California.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Each learning center is comprised of three essential components:

- *Teaching and Learning* encompasses the content, structures, and processes of curriculum and teaching. The content includes the integration of standards; a thematic, interdisciplinary curriculum transitions from school to work and postsecondary education; and project-based experiential learning opportunities.
- *Learning Supports* develop a sense of community within and outside of school and integrate health and human services at the school site, filling a gap often found in the restructuring movement in education. The concept emphasizes that a program committed to the success of all children must be designed with an array of activities to "enable" learning, such as: providing advocates for each child and actively engaging parents and community members in school processes.
- *Governance and Management* advances empowerment of and collaboration among all learning community members, including students, parents, teachers, administrators, staff and members of the outside community. The relevant tasks, organizational elements, and processes reflect the need both to strive to be inclusive of and build capacity among all stakeholders. Through collaborative decision making, the design especially seeks to include those who historically have not had a voice in governance and management.

In addition, the Urban Learning Center uses technology to support all elements of the design. Within the instructional program, students and staff use technology as a tool to obtain, construct, and communicate knowledge. Administrative uses include communications, programmatic budgeting, and assessing achievement trends. In addition, technology assists the learning supports component with locating, referring, and tracking the outcomes of students needing social services.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Improve student learning
- Meet the learning needs of students placed at risk
- Restructure school organization

- Increase family involvement
- Increase community involvement
- Increase access to nonacademic services (e.g., medical, social)
- Improve school climate
- Redefine relations among teachers, learners, and curriculum
- Expand professional roles of regular classroom teachers

STUDENTS SERVED

Urban students

GRADE LEVELS

Urban Learning Center is a comprehensive reform program implemented in grades Pre-K-12.

PROGRAM PRACTICES

Representatives from each of the programs described in this section indicated the practices, as listed in Table 3 on page 7, that are featured in their school reform effort. Research-based practices, designated with an asterisk, are those that are firmly grounded in the research literature on what influences student learning.

CLASSROOM PRACTICES

* High expectations for students
Active learning
Constructivist strategies
* Metacognitive strategies
* Peer tutoring
Heterogeneous grouping
Use of technology

CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT

* Alignment of curriculum and assessment
Authentic assessments
* Integration of content areas
Challenging academic content

SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE

Teacher collaboration on content and instruction
* Parent involvement
* Community involvement
Prevention oriented
Assess school/program strengths and weaknesses
* Positive schoolwide climate

Flexible scheduling
Shared school vision
* Shared decision making on school policies
Coordinated school-linked services
Site-based governance

IMPLEMENTATION

Ongoing professional development is essential to the Urban Learning Center. Schools participate in a self-assessment process leading to a multi-year plan for change and improvement. Professional development activities are planned to meet each school's greatest areas of need. Workshops and seminars, peer coaching, visits to other classrooms and schools, and coaching and guidance through a teacher's practitioner network are available to all faculty.

EXPECTED PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Achievement of local and state standards; in addition all graduates will be able to:

- Solve complex problems using information retrieval skills, technological tools, and higher-order reasoning
- Use English to function as an informed citizen, to be effective at work, and to become empowered to continue life-long learning
- Acquire an in-depth knowledge of world and local history and geography, the facility to interact respectfully with people from diverse cultures and backgrounds, and the ability to participate in civic and community affairs
- Make critical and informed judgments about a variety of arts and aesthetics and relate visual and performing arts to history, literature, and other disciplines
- Demonstrate personal qualities including a sense of responsibility, kindness, self-esteem, sociability, self-management, integrity, and honesty
- Commit themselves to global as well as to community and national stewardship and citizenship
- Enter the workforce as competent, productive employees and continue postsecondary education

PROGRAM EFFECTS

The first two high school graduating classes in Urban Learning Center schools in low socioeconomic areas showed a high attendance rate, few dropouts, and strong grade-point averages for twelfth graders. A large number of students from both schools are attending 4-year colleges. Fourteen percent of the students at one school and 12% at the other plan to attend the University of California, placing the schools among the top 25% of all schools as measured by the High Schools Performance Report of the California Department of Education (Johnson & McDonald, 1996).

These results support research that smaller high schools improve student outcomes, especially in troubled urban areas. In addition, each model school possesses a

Learning Support system on campus including a family center, a complete health clinic, a parent volunteer program, and an array of parent education classes. At one of the two original learning centers, nearly 400 parents attend adult education classes weekly. The Urban Learning Center design works with each participating school annually to analyze progress in student achievement and implementation.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Johnson, J., & McDonald, J. (1996). Los Angeles Learning Centers: An initiative of Los Angeles Unified School District, United Teachers Los Angeles, and Los Angeles Educational Partnership. In S. Stringfield, S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools Designs* (pp. 261-288). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

PART III:
UTILIZING THE PROGRAM INFORMATION FOR DECISION MAKING

A pressing task for policymakers and practitioners faced with the challenge of significantly improving the capacity of schools to achieve a high standard of educational outcomes for each student is the identification and implementation of practices most likely to maximize student learning. The *Program Decision-Making Framework* described in this section of the Handbook uses descriptions of program features (see Table 2) and prevalent program practices (see Table 3) to provide a systematic method for analysis of externally designed programs. Alternatively, this tool can be used as a framework of guiding principles for designing innovative programs by school staff.

In this section of the Handbook, an illustration is provided to demonstrate how the framework shown in Tables 2 and 3 can be utilized to generate a comparative database on selected programs a particular user is interested in to make informed program decisions. The framework provides a structure for: identifying and selecting externally developed innovative research-based practices for adoption and adaptation; describing and documenting critical features of existing programs; and providing a design framework for developing local programs.

DEVELOPING AN INDICATOR SYSTEM FOR PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Table 4 (on page 176) provides an illustration of how the *Program Decision-Making Framework* can be used to analyze the critical design features and outcomes of extant programs or to describe features of innovative programs being implemented or considered for implementation by school staff at the building and/or district level. See Appendix A for a blank *Framework* for your use.

Column 1 (Program Emphasis) consists of a list of salient design features and practices emphasized among widely implemented research-based reform programs (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1998) and can serve as an initial basis for making programming decisions.

The Selected Programs Columns indicate the feature or practice emphasized in the design of a given program; the "X's" in the table indicate the program emphasis of hypothetical programs A-D. Thus, for example, Program B, a hypothetical comprehensive reform program, includes "improving school climate" as a program emphasis, and the program design is applied across all subjects in its scope of implementation. Program D, on the other hand, is a curriculum-focused reform program that does not emphasize "restructuring school organization" in its design, but does focus on reading instruction as a key program component.

The User's Importance Rating column shows the rating given by the school staff based on consensus for the importance of a particular feature emphasis in a particular program. A rating of "3" (on a 3-point scale) for a given category indicates that, based on the consensus of the school staff, the particular feature or practice is considered to be highly important to the improvement of the school's capacity for

achieving student learning success. A rating of "1" for a given category, on the other hand, indicates that the particular feature or practice is considered by the school staff to be less important based on the school's improvement needs. The "X's" listed under each program column indicate that a particular feature or practice is explicitly emphasized in the design of a specific program being considered by the school staff.

The Importance Index column lists the index number of each practice in terms of its relation to the goals of the school. Thus, for a school attempting to choose one of four programs, the indices provide a quantitative basis for initial decision making. For example, for the school staff, Program A probably will not meet the goal of the school because the school is looking for a program that is comprehensive ("3" was entered by the user in the "Comprehensive Reform Program" row). Although there are some features of Program A that are important to the user (see importance rating in the user column), in adding the total features emphasized by Program A (a total score of 43) and comparing this total with that of Program B (a comprehensive program with a total score of 133), Program B is a "closer fit" in terms of the importance of these features to the user.

CALCULATING DECISION-MAKING INDICATORS

Several simple indices can be generated based on the *Program Decision-Making Framework* to provide a database for identifying program development needs; selecting a particular program for adoption or adaptation based on the program's features and practices; and identifying areas that require improvement for a particular school.

As shown in Table 4, using the consensus weightings of the school staff and the information on features explicitly considered in the design of the various programs, potential adopters of specific programs can develop an *Importance Index* that serves as an indicator of the extent to which a given research-based, innovative program meets site-specific improvement needs. The first step in developing an *Importance Index* is to calculate the "importance rating" given by the user (e.g., the school staff). This is done by asking potential users to rate the importance of the features or practices according to their own judgments about the program improvement needs of their respective schools, using a 3-point scale (see Table 4, Column 3: User's Importance Index). The ratings may be based on a variety of user-specific information (e.g., their own experiences, current programs implemented in their respective schools, knowledge of a particular set of research findings, philosophical alliances or differences on a specific instructional approach, and the importance of the variables from their own perspective or those of particular stakeholder groups).

Importance indices are used to indicate the relative importance of selected program design features and practices in terms of site-specific contexts and perspectives. The quantitative indices derived from a user's importance index will enable the user to make decisions, determining the extent to which the program-specific features

and practices of the various reform programs being considered meet the program improvement and implementation support needs of the respective school or district. For example, if a particular user were interested in adopting either Program B or Program C, both of which are comprehensive school reform programs, the *Importance Index* (that is, the total of the importance indices across features and practices, and program emphases) could be used as one of the criteria for selecting one of the programs under consideration. For School X, for example, Program B may be a more appropriate choice because the *Importance Index*, based on staff consensus on important features and practices for meeting their improvement needs and Program B's design, is higher (the calculated *Importance Index* for that school is 133) than that of Program D (the total *Importance Index* for that school is 65).

OTHER APPLICATIONS OF THE PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK

Although the foregoing discussion shows how the *Program Decision-Making Framework* can be used by school staff in making decisions about externally developed programs they may consider for adoption or adaptation for meeting the specific improvement needs of their respective schools, it may also provide useful guidelines for schools and districts in designing their own improvement programs and/or evaluating current programs being implemented by the school staff. The list of design features and practices included in the *Framework* can serve as a checklist to determine which features and practices are critical in designing or adopting externally developed improvement programs and/or designing school-specific programs. The checklist ensures that the program design incorporates research-based features and practices that are considered to be important to learning by the school staff and allows for comparison on that basis with the designs of some of the widely implemented, research-based externally developed programs.

If all features and practices are of equal importance to improving student learning, the fully implemented programs could potentially include more features and practices that would improve learning the most. In actual practice, however, all the features and practices included in a given program are unlikely to be of equal importance. Programs with extensive features are likely to be more costly to implement and more complex to manage. Therefore, both program developers and users need to carefully analyze the site-specific constraints and needs and weigh the trade-offs between cost and effectiveness in identifying priorities and in making programmatic decisions.

TABLE 4
PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK

PROGRAM EMPHASES	SELECTED PROGRAMS: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D	USER'S IMPORTANCE RATING	IMPORTANCE INDEX: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D
TYPE OF REFORM									
Comprehensive Reform Program		x	x		3		3	3	
Curricular Reform Program	x			x	—				
GOALS									
Improve Student Learning	x	x	x	x	3	3	3	3	3
Meet the Learning Needs of Students Placed At Risk	x	x			3	3	3		
Foster Positive Student Perceptions					2				
Increase Student-directed Learning		x			3		3		
Increase Equity in Opportunity to Learn		x			3		3		
Restructure School Organization			x		2			2	
Increase Family Involvement		x	x	x	2		2	2	2
Increase Community Involvement		x			1		1		
Increase Access to Non-academic Services (e.g., medical, social)		x			1		1		
Improve School Climate		x	x		3		3	3	
Enrich Curriculum and Instruction	x	x		x	2	2	2		2
Redefine Relations Among Teachers, Learners, & Curriculum					2				
Expand Professional Roles of Regular Classroom Teachers		x		x	2		2		2
STUDENTS SERVED									
All Students		x	x	x	3		3	3	3
Title I	x				2	2			
Special Needs/Mild-Moderate Handicap					1				
Young Readers with Reading Difficulties	x				1	1			
ESL or Bilingual					2				
Urban Students	x	x	x	x	3	3	3	3	3
Rural Students		x		x	1		1		1
GRADE LEVELS									
Pre-K					—				
K-1	x				—				
K-6 (Elementary)		x	x	x	3		3	3	3
Middle/Junior High School		x			—				
High School					—				
CURRICULAR FOCUS									
Reading	x			x	—				
Writing				x	—				
Mathematics					—				
Language Arts/Literature				x	—				
Science					—				
History and Social Sciences					—				
Fine Arts					—				
All Subjects		x	x		3		3	3	
Critical Thinking Skills and Learning Process		x	x	x	3		3	3	3
Study Skills		x			3		3		
IMPORTANCE INDEX					57	14	45	28	22

TABLE 4
PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK (CONT'D)

PROGRAM EMPHASES	SELECTED PROGRAMS: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D	USER'S IMPORTANCE RATING	IMPORTANCE INDEX: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D
CLASSROOM PRACTICES									
* High Expectations for Students	x	x	x	x	3	3	3	3	3
* Frequent High-Quality Academic Interactions Among Teachers and Students	x	x	x	x	2	2	2	2	2
Active Learning	x	x	x	x	2	2	2	2	2
Constructivist Strategies	x	x		x	2	2	2		2
* Metacognitive Strategies		x			3		3		
Teacher as Facilitator		x		x	3		3		3
* Student-Directed Learning		x		x	3		3		3
* Direct Instruction	x	x	x	x	3	3	3	3	3
* Small-Group Instruction	x	x		x	2	2	2		2
* Frequent High-Quality Social Interactions Among Teachers and Students	x	x			2	2	2		
* Cooperative Learning		x		x	2		2		2
* Positive Classroom Climate		x	x	x	3		3	3	3
Teacher Modeling of Attitudes, Behaviors, and Skills		x	x		2		2	2	
Teacher Models Higher Order Thinking					2				
Hands-on Activities		x			3		3		
* Adaptive Instructional Strategies		x			2		2		
* Peer Tutoring					1				
* Tutoring Teacher/Aide and Student	x	x			—				
Heterogeneous Grouping		x		x	1		1		1
Use of Technology		x	x		3		3	3	
Student Choice of Learning Activities		x		x	2		2		2
Multiple Intelligences	x				2	2			
Homogeneous Grouping									
CLASSROOM PRACTICES FEATURED	**9**	**19**	**7**	**12**	**48**	**18**	**43**	**18**	**28**
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT									
* Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment		x	x	x	3		3	3	3
Attend to Foundation of Basic Skills	x	x	x	x	3	3	3	3	3
Learning Processes		x			2		2		
Authentic Assessments	x	x		x	2	2	2		2
* Tailored to Student Ability and Academic Background	x	x		x	3	3	3		3
* Integration of Content Areas		x			2		2		
* Tailored to Student Cultural Background					2				
Challenging Academic Content		x			2		2		
* Use of Individual Learning Plans		x			2		2		
* Frequent Assessments		x			2		2		
Multicultural Content	x	x		x	2	2	2		2
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES FEATURED	**4**	**10**	**2**	**5**	**25**	**10**	**23**	**6**	**13**

*Program practices marked with an asterisk are firmly grounded in research on what influences student learning (Wang, M.C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. [1993]. What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*[4], 74-79).

TABLE 4
PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK (CONT'D)

PROGRAM EMPHASES	SELECTED PROGRAMS: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D	USER'S IMPORTANCE RATING	IMPORTANCE INDEX: PROGRAM A	PROGRAM B	PROGRAM C	PROGRAM D
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE									
Teacher Collaboration on Content and Instruction		x			1		1		
* Parent Involvement		x	x		2		2	2	
School Restructuring		x			2		2		
Consensus Building (to initiate and/or sustain program)		x	x		1		1	1	
* Principal as Facilitator and Support Provider		x	x		1		1	1	
* Community Involvement		x			1		1		
Kindergarten	x	x	x	x	1	1	1	1	1
Prevention Oriented		x	x	x	1		1	1	1
Assess School/Program Strengths and Weaknesses		x	x		1		1	1	
* Positive Schoolwide Climate		x	x		2		2	2	
Flexible Scheduling		x			2		2		
Shared School Vision		x	x		3		3	3	
* Small Class Size					1				
* Shared Decision Making on School Policies		x	x		1		1		
Coordinated School-linked Services		x			1		1		
Site-Specific Improvement Plan		x	x		1		1	1	
Site-Based Governance		x	x		1		1	1	
* Inclusive School		x	x		—				
Pullout for Instruction	x				—				
Encourage Action Research					2				
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE PRACTICES FEATURED	**2**	**17**	**12**	**2**	**25**	**1**	**22**	**14**	**2**
USER'S IMPORTANCE RATING SCORE					**98**				
PROGRAM IMPORTANCE INDICATOR INDEX					**155**	**43**	**133**	**66**	**65**

*Program practices marked with an asterisk are firmly grounded in research on what influences student learning (Wang, M.C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. [1993]. What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*[4], 74-79).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUDING REMARKS

An important premise underlying educational reform is that educational success of students can be nurtured through interventions that incorporate advances in theory and research into effective practices along with practical wisdom. In many cases, such innovations have been shown to work, but only for small groups of targeted children (Wang, Haertel, & Walberg, 1993; Education Commission of the States, 1991; Fashola & Slavin, 1998; New American Schools, 1996). Rather than attempting to identify a general underlying deficit in students requiring greater-than-usual instructional support, effective practices should be emphasized to ensure student learning outcomes.

If widespread implementation of innovative programs and practices is to occur, information is needed to further the understanding and specification of what constitutes effectiveness, the conditions that influence effectiveness, and the features of cost-effective alternative programs and practices. A useful application of the *Program Decision-Making Framework* is the identification and evaluation of innovative programs that aim to achieve a high standard of student outcomes using a data-based approach with specific criteria and implementation credibility. In the context of the *Framework*, educational success is characterized in terms of the use of research-based effective practices, such as high expectations for students, frequent high-quality academic interactions between teachers and students, alignment of curriculum and assessment, attention to grouping practices and other proven practices based on current research, and knowledge on practical applications.

Many national, state, and local school improvement efforts have energized their most creative people to find ways to effectively provide for the diverse learning needs of every student in our schools. Among the examples of national initiatives are the Head Start and Follow Through programs, both of which were designed to improve schooling outcomes of students from economically disadvantaged homes. These programs were initiated in the late 1960s as part of the federal government's War on Poverty program, the Title I program development effort to improve basic skills of low-achieving students from economically disadvantaged homes, and the Regular Education Initiative, which sought to improve coordination and articulation of the work of special and regular educators to improve learning outcomes of students with special needs (Will, 1986).

Clearly, there has been no lack of ideas about what to do to improve instruction and student learning. What has been glaringly lacking, however, is the knowledge base on systematic identification and selection of research-based school reform programs that meet school improvement needs to ensure schooling success of each student with a high level of accountability.

Efforts that lead to the implementation of innovative school programs to significantly improve instruction and learning require major rethinking and restructuring—not an easy task for schools to accomplish. Nevertheless, segregating the poorly motivated or difficult-to-teach students in programs that make few demands and offer few opportunities to succeed is not an option. The challenge now is to put innovations that work in place everywhere, for all students. The Handbook aims to meet the challenge by providing an information base on features and practices included by widely implemented research-based reform programs and suggesting ways this information can be used for systematic analysis and informed program decisions.

REFERENCES

Education Commission of the States. (1991). *Restructuring the educational system: A consumer's guide, Vol. 1*. Denver, CO: Author.

Fashola, O. S., & Slavin, R. Schoolwide reform models: What works? *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(5), 370-379.

New American Schools Development Corp. (NASDC) (1996). *A Guide to New American Schools*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993a). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(3), 249-294.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993b). What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*(4), 74-79.

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1998). Widely disseminated improvement programs. *Educational Leadership, 55*(7), 66-71.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (Eds.). (1995). *Making a difference for students at risk. Trends and alternatives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Will, M. (1986). *Educating students with learning problems—A Shared Responsibility. A report to the secretary*. Washington, DC: Office of Education and Rehabilitative Services.

Appendix
Program Decision-Making Framework

Program Decision-Making Framework

Program Emphases	Programs				
Type of Reform					
Comprehensive Reform Program					
Curricular Reform Program					
Goals					
Improve Student Learning					
Meet the Learning Needs of Students Placed At Risk					
Foster Positive Student Perceptions					
Increase Student-directed Learning					
Increase Equity in Opportunity to Learn					
Restructure School Organization					
Increase Family Involvement					
Increase Community Involvement					
Increase Access to Non-academic Services (e.g., medical, social)					
Improve School Climate					
Enrich Curriculum and Instruction					
Redefine Relations Among Teachers, Learners, & Curriculum					
Expand Professional Roles of Regular Classroom Teachers					
Students Served					
All Students					
Title I					
Special Needs/Mild-Moderate Handicap					
Young Readers with Reading Difficulties					
ESL or Bilingual					
Urban Students					
Rural Students					
Grade Levels					
Pre-K					
K-1					
K-6 (Elementary)					
Middle/Junior High School					
High School					
Curricular Focus					
Reading					
Writing					
Mathematics					
Language Arts/Literature					
Science					
History and Social Sciences					
Fine Arts					
All Subjects					
Critical Thinking Skills and Learning Process					
Study Skills					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK (CONT'D)

PROGRAM EMPHASES	PROGRAMS
CLASSROOM PRACTICES	
* High Expectations for Students	
* Frequent High-Quality Academic Interactions Among Teachers and Students	
Active Learning	
Constructivist Strategies	
* Metacognitive Strategies	
Teacher as Facilitator	
* Student-Directed Learning	
* Direct Instruction	
* Small-Group Instruction	
* Frequent High-Quality Social Interactions Among Teachers and Students	
* Cooperative Learning	
* Positive Classroom Climate	
Teacher Modeling of Attitudes, Behaviors, and Skills	
Teacher Models Higher Order Thinking	
Hands-on Activities	
* Adaptive Instructional Strategies	
* Peer Tutoring	
* Tutoring-Teacher/Aide and Student	
Heterogeneous Grouping	
Use of Technology	
Student Choice of Learning Activities	
Multiple Intelligences	
Homogeneous Grouping	
CLASSROOM PRACTICES FEATURED	
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT	
* Alignment of Curriculum and Assessment	
Attend to Foundation of Basic Skills	
Learning Processes	
Authentic Assessments	
* Tailored to Student Ability and Academic Background	
* Integration of Content Areas	
* Tailored to Student Cultural Background	
Challenging Academic Content	
* Use of Individual Learning Plans	
* Frequent Assessments	
Multicultural Content	
CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES FEATURED	

*Program practices marked with an asterisk are firmly grounded in research on what influences student learning (Wang, M.C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. [1993]. What helps students learn? *Educational Leadership, 51*[4], 74-79).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK (CONT'D)

PROGRAM EMPHASES	PROGRAMS
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE	
Teacher Collaboration on Content and Instruction	
* Parent Involvement	
School Restructuring	
Consensus Building (to initiate and/or sustain program)	
* Principal as Facilitator and Support Provider	
* Community Involvement	
Kindergarten	
Prevention Oriented	
Assess School/Program Strengths and Weaknesses	
* Positive Schoolwide Climate	
Flexible Scheduling	
Shared School Vision	
* Small Class Size	
* Shared Decision Making on School Policies	
Coordinated School-linked Services	
Site-Specific Improvement Plan	
Site-Based Governance	
* Inclusive School	
Pullout for Instruction	
Encourage Action Research	
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND CLIMATE PRACTICES FEATURED	
NUMBER OF PRACTICES FEATURED	
NUMBER OF RESEARCH-BASED PRACTICES FEATURED	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Laboratory for Student Success

The Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) is one of 10 regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education to revitalize and reform educational practices in the service of student success.

The LSS mission is to significantly improve the capacity of the mid-Atlantic region—including Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Washington, DC—to enact and sustain lasting systemic educational reform by building on the resources of schools, families, and communities in the region to improve student learning. Through its broad-based programs of applied research and development and services to the field, LSS provides ongoing professional development and technical assistance to support efforts of local schools and state education agencies to achieve student success.

LSS was designated by the U.S. Department of Education as the lead laboratory for urban school reform. Accordingly, LSS has developed a national Urban Education Enhancement Program to address emerging issues of importance in strengthening our capacity to achieve healthy development and educational success of students in urban communities, and developing strategies for implementing and sustaining urban school reform.

LSS Principal Investigators

JoAnn Manning
Associate Director, LSS

Margaret C. Wang
Executive Director
Professor of Educational Psychology
Temple University

Julia St. George
Assistant Director for Administration, LSS

Lascelles Anderson
Center for Urban Educational Research and Development
University of Illinois at Chicago

Jennifer Beaumont
Senior Research Associate
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

William Boyd
Professor of Education
Pennsylvania State University

Bruce Cooper
Professor of Education
Fordham University

Ramona Edelin
President and Chief Executive Officer
National Urban Coalition

Fenwick English
Professor of Educational Administration
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Study
Iowa State University

William Evans
Senior Research Associate
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

Patricia Gennari
Director of Special Projects
Penn Hills School District

Penny Hammrich
Assistant Professor of Science Education, Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education
Temple University

Jeong-Ran Kim
Senior Research Associate
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

Evelyn Klein
Senior Research Associate
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

Robert Lebeau
Director of Advanced Technology Laboratory
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

Ruth Palmer
Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Secondary Education
The College of New Jersey

Suzanne Pasch
Dean
Education and Graduate Studies
The College of New Jersey

Sam Redding
Executive Director
Academic Development Institute

Maynard Reynolds
Professor Emeritus of Educational Psychology
University of Minnesota

Timothy Shanahan
Professor of Urban Education
University of Illinois-Chicago

Sharon Sherman
Associate Professor of Elementary and Early Childhood Education
The College of New Jersey

Betty Steffy
Professor of Educational Administration
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Study
Iowa State University

Floraline Stevens
Evaluation Consultant
Floraline I. Stevens Associates

Judith Stull
Associate Professor of Sociology
LaSalle University

William Stull
Professor of Economics
Temple University

Ronald Taylor
Associate Professor of Psychology
Temple University

Deborah Thompson
Senior Research Associate
Center for Research in Human Development and Education
Temple University

Herbert Walberg
Professor of Education
University of Illinois

Carol Walker
Associate Professor of Education
The Catholic University of America

Robert Walter
Professor Emeritus of Education
Policy and Leadership Studies
Temple University

Roger Weissberg
Professor of Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago

Kenneth Wong
Associate Professor of Education
University of Chicago

William Yancey
Professor of Sociology
Temple University

Frank Yekovich
Professor of Education
The Catholic University of America

For more information, contact Cynthia Smith, Director of Information Services, at (215) 204-3000 or csmith6@vm.temple.edu.

To contact the LSS:
Phone: (800) 892-5550
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu
Web: http://www.temple.edu/LSS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE